The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXVIII, No. 5 MAY, 1953

CONTENTS

Church and State: Some Present Problems in the Light of the Teaching of Pope Pius XII
Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani 321

St. Ignatius' Letter on Obedience: 1553-1953
John A. Hardon, S.J. 335

St. Thomas and Our Lady's Assumption
William J. Kerrigan 347

Moral Aspects of Inflation ..... *Leo A. Foley, S.M.* 350

San Diego Campaigns for Souls ..... *John A. O'Brien* 362

Major Issue of Parish Sociology ... *Joseph H. Fichter, S.J.* 369

Of Course You Can Sing! ..... *John P. Ashton* 384

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Social Gatherings of Priests 389

A Legislator's Problem 389

Non-Catholic as Proxy at Baptism 390

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1953, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Courtship by a Married Person 390
Mutilation for the Sake of Another 391
First Friday and Good Friday 392
Nuptial Blessing 392
Scapular Medal 393
Votive Mass of the Holy Spirit 393
Folded Chasubles 394
Blessing before Childbirth 394

BOOK REVIEWS

Life Everlasting, *by Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P.* 395
No Secret Is Safe, *by Mark Tennien, M.M.* 397
The Light of the World, *by Rt. Rev. Benedict Bauer, O.S.B.* 398

BOOK MANUSCRIPTS INVITED

If you are looking for a publisher, send for our free, illustrated booklet titled *To the Author in Search of a Publisher.* It tells how we can publish, promote and distribute your book, as we have done for hundreds of other writers. All subjects considered. New authors welcomed. Write today for Booklet ER. It's free.

✦

VANTAGE PRESS, Inc.,
120 W. 31 St., N. Y. 1.
In Calif.: 6356 Hollywood Blvd., Hollywood 28

A Friendly Suggestion

From time to time, your students may ask what would be an appropriate gift for a newly ordained priest. Perhaps you ask yourself the same question.

What better gift, within a reasonable price range, could you suggest, entirely in keeping with the man and his life purpose than: A Subscription to *The American Ecclesiastical Review?* We shall gladly send an appropriate gift notice.

Why not keep us in mind?

Special rate for newly-ordained—$4.00 a year.

Address:

The American Ecclesiastical Review
c/o Catholic Univ. of America
620 Michigan Avenue, N.E.
Washington 17, D C.

CHURCH AND STATE: SOME PRESENT PROBLEMS IN THE LIGHT OF THE TEACHING OF POPE PIUS XII

It is not surprising that the enemies of the Church have always opposed its mission, denying some, or even all, of its divine prerogatives and powers.

With its deceptive pretenses, the force of the attack was already directed against the Divine Founder of this two thousand year old and yet ever youthful institution. Against Him the cry is raised, as it was raised long ago, "We will not have this man to reign over us."[1]

And, with the patience and the serenity that come to it from the assurance of its divinely promised destiny and from the certainty of its divine mission, the Church sings throughout the centuries: "He who gives heavenly kingdoms does not take away earthly ones."

On the other hand we are astonished, and our astonishment grows into bewilderment and finally turns to sadness, when the attempt to take the spiritual arms of justice and truth from the hands of this good Mother, the Church, is made by the Church's own children, and even by those children who live in interconfessional states, coming into continual contact with dissident brethren, and who thus ought to recognize, more than others, their debt of gratitude towards this Mother who has always used her rights to defend, to watch over, and to safeguard her own faithful.

THE CHARISMATIC CHURCH AND THE JURIDICAL CHURCH

Today some hold that there is only a spiritual order in the Church, and consequently they come to say that the nature of the Church's law is in opposition to the nature of the Church itself.

According to these people, the original sacramental element of the Church has become progressively weakened so that it has given way to the jurisdictional element, which is now the force and the power of the Church. As the Protestant jurist Sohm held,

[1] *Luke* 19:14.

the notion that the Church of God is constituted like the State has come to prevail.

But Canon 108, §3, speaking of the existence in the Church of the power of orders and the power of jurisdiction, appeals to divine right. The texts of the Gospels, the assertions of the Acts of the Apostles, and the citations from the letters of the Apostles, all of them frequently cited by authors in the field of Public Ecclesiastical Law to prove the divine origin of the above-mentioned powers and the rights of the Church, demonstrate that this appeal of Canon 108 §3 is justified.

In the encyclical *Mystici Corporis,* the august Pontiff now gloriously reigning treats of this subject in the following terms:

> For this reason We deplore and condemn the pernicious error of those who conjure up from their fancies an imaginary Church, a kind of society that finds its origin and growth in charity, to which they somewhat contemptuously oppose another, which they call juridical. But this distinction, which they introduce, is baseless. For they fail to understand that the same reason that led our divine Redeemer to give to the community of men He founded the constitution of a society, perfect of its kind, containing all the juridical and social elements, namely that He might perpetuate on earth the saving work of Redemption, was also the reason He wished it to be enriched with the heavenly gifts of the Consoling Spirit.[2]

Consequently its Divine Founder does not wish the Church to be a State, but He has constituted it as a *perfect society,* equipped with all the powers inherent in that juridical condition, so that it may carry out its mission in every State without opposition between the two societies of which He is, though in different ways, the Author and the Support.

ADHERENCE TO THE ORDINARY MAGISTERIUM

There comes up here the problem of the association of the Church with the lay state. There are certain Catholics who, on this subject, are spreading abroad ideas that are somewhat inexact.

One cannot deny that many among such Catholics have a love for the Church and a right intention to find a way of possible adaptation to the circumstances of the times. But it is none the

[2] *Acta apostolicae sedis (AAS),* XXXV, 224.

less true that their position is comparable to that of a timid soldier who wants to win without fighting, or to that of a naive person who takes hold of a hand held out to him treacherously, without realizing that this hand is going to pull him across the Rubicon towards error and injustice.

The first fault of these persons consists precisely in their failure to accept fully the *arma veritatis* and the teachings which the Roman Pontiffs during the past century, and particularly the reigning Pontiff Pius XII, have given to Catholics on this subject in encyclical letters, allocutions, and instructions of various kinds.

To justify themselves, these people assert that in the body of teaching imparted within the Church there are to be distinguished two elements, the one permanent, and the other transient. This latter is supposed to be due to the reflection of particular contemporary conditions.

Unfortunately, they carry this tactic so far as to apply it to the principles taught in pontifical documents, principles on which the teachings of the Popes have remained constant so as to make these principles a part of the patrimony of Catholic doctrine.

On this subject, the pendulum theory, excogitated by certain writers in an attempt to sort out the teachings set forth in encyclical letters at various times, accepting some teachings and rejecting others, cannot be applied. It has been written that:

> The Church measures the rhythm of the world's history like a swinging pendulum which, wanting to keep proper measure, continues to move by reversing its direction when it judges that it has gone as far as it should. . . . In this light, an entire history of the encyclicals could be written. Thus in the field of biblical studies, the *Divino afflante Spiritu* comes after the *Spiritus Paraclitus* and the *Providentissimus*. In the field of theology or politics, the *Summi Pontificatus*, the *Non abbiamo bisogno*, and the *Ubi arcano Dei*, come after the *Immortale Dei*.[3]

Now if this be intended to mean that the general and fundamental principles of public ecclesiastical law solemnly affirmed in the *Immortale Dei* reflect only historic moments of the past, while the pendulum of the doctrinal encyclicals of Pius XI and of Pius

[3] Cf. *Témoignage chrétien*, for Sept. 1, 1950, reported in *Documentation catholique* of Oct. 8, 1950.

XII would have passed in its reversal of direction to different positions, the teaching should be considered as entirely erroneous, not only because it misrepresents the actual content of the encyclicals themselves, but also because it is theoretically inadmissible.

In the *Humani generis,* the reigning Pontiff teaches how we ought to accept the ordinary magisterium of the Church in the encyclicals.

> Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not in itself demand assent, on the grounds that the Popes, in writing such letters, do not exercise the supreme power of their teaching authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is also true to say: "He who heareth you, heareth me"; and generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical Letters already for other reasons pertains to Catholic doctrine.[4]

Fearing that they may be accused of wanting to return to the Middle Ages, some of our writers are reluctant to hold on this point the doctrinal positions which are constantly affirmed in the encyclicals as applying to the life and the law of the Church for all times. To them is directed the warning of Leo XIII which, recommending concord and unity in fighting against error, adds that "on this point we must see to it that no one connives at false opinions or fights against them less energetically than truth may allow."[5]

THE DUTIES OF A CATHOLIC STATE

Having touched upon the preliminary question of the assent that is due to the teachings of the Church, even in its ordinary magisterium, let us come to a practical question, which, in present-day terminology, we may call "burning." This is the question of a Catholic state and of its relative implications with reference to non-Catholic sects.

It is known that in some countries, in which there are absolute Catholic majorities, the Catholic religion has been proclaimed as the religion of the State in their respective Constitutions.

This has aroused the protests of many non-Catholics and un-

[4] *AAS,* XLIII, 568.
[5] From the *Immortale Dei,* in the *Acta Leonis XIII,* V, 148.

believers. And, what is still more displeasing, it is regarded also as anachronistic by some Catholics, who think that the Church can live peacefully and in the full possession of its own rights in a lay State, even when the State is composed of Catholics.

We know the controversy recently carried on between two authors of opposing views. One of these who supports the thesis we have just mentioned holds the following:

(1) The State, properly speaking, cannot perform an act of religion. (The State is a mere symbol or a group of institutions.)

(2) "An immediate illation from the order of ethical and theological truth to the order of constitutional law is, in principle, dialectically inadmissible." That is, the State's obligation to worship God can never enter into the constitutional sphere.

(3) Finally, even for a State composed of Catholics, there is no obligation to profess the Catholic religion. As far as the obligation to protect it is concerned, this does not become operative except in determined circumstances, and precisely when the freedom of the Church cannot otherwise be guaranteed.

Hence there come attacks directed against the teaching set forth in the manuals of public ecclesiastical law, without consideration of the fact that such teaching is based, for the most part, on the doctrine expounded in pontifical documents.

Now if there is any certain and indisputable truth to be found among the general principles of public ecclesiastical law, it is the truth that the rulers in a state composed almost entirely of Catholics and consequently and consistently governed by Catholics, have the duty to influence the legislation of that state in a Catholic sense. Three immediate implications follow from this duty.

(1) The *social,* and not merely the *private* profession of the religion of the people;

(2) The Christian inspiration of legislation;

(3) The defense of the religious patrimony of the people against every assault which seeks to deprive them of the treasure of their faith and of their religious peace.

I have said, first of all, that *the State has the duty of professing its religion socially.*

Men united socially are no less subject to God than when they

are taken as individuals, and the civil society, no less than individual men, is in God's debt, "under Whom, as Author, it is gathered together, by whose power it is preserved, by whose goodness it has received the great treasure of good things which it enjoys."[6]

Thus, as it is not licit for any individual to fail in his duty to God and to the religion by which God wills to be honored, in the same way, "states cannot, without serious moral offense *(citra scelus)* conduct themselves as if God were non-existent or cast off the care of religion as something foreign to themselves or of little moment."[7]

Pius XII reinforces this teaching condemning "the error contained in conceptions such as do not hesitate to absolve civil authority from all dependence upon the Supreme Being, the First Cause and the Absolute Master both of man and of society, and from every bond of transcendant law which proceeds from God as from its primary Source, and that concede to civil authority an unlimited power of action, a power left to the ever changing wave of whims or to the sole restraints of contingent historical exigencies and of relative interests."

And, continuing, the august Pontiff shows what consequences, disastrous also for the liberty and the rights of man, flow from this error. "When the authority of God and the power of His law have been thus denied, the civil power, by a necessary consequence, tends to attribute to itself that absolute autonomy which belongs only to the Creator, and to substitute itself for the Omnipotent, raising the State or the collectivity to be the supreme end of life, the supreme norm of the moral and juridical order."[8]

I have said, secondly, that it is the duty of rulers *to have the moral principles of religion influence the social activity proper to the State and its legislation.*

This is a consequence of the duty of religion and of submission due to God, not only on the part of individuals, but also on the part of society. This has the advantage of being for the true well-being of the people.

[6] *Ibid., Acta Leonis XIII,* V, 122.
[7] *Ibid., Acta Leonis XIII,* V, 123.
[8] From the *Summi pontificatus, AAS,* XXXI, 466.

Against the moral and religious agnosticism of the State and of its laws, Pius XII held up the concept of the Christian State in his august letter of Oct. 19, 1945, for the nineteenth Social Week of the Italian Catholics, in which, precisely, the problem of the new Constitution was to be studied.

> Reflecting well on the evil consequences that such a constitution, abandoning the "corner stone" of the Christian concept of life, and attempting to base itself on moral and religious agnosticism, would bring into the heart of society and into its transient history, every Catholic will easily understand how the question which before every other, ought now to attract his attention and stir up his activity, is that of assuring for this and for future generations the benefit of a fundamental law of the State which is not opposed to sound religious and moral principles, but which rather draws vigorous inspiration from them and proclaims and wisely pursues their lofty purposes.[9]

The Supreme Pontiff, on this point, has not failed to attribute "the praise due to the wisdom of those rulers who either always have favored or wished and knew how to honor, in the best interests of the people, the values of Christian civilization in the happy relations between Church and State, in safeguarding the sanctity of marriage, and in the religious education of youth."[10]

In the third place, I have said that it is the duty of rulers of a Catholic State *to protect from everything that would undermine it the religious unity of a people who unanimously know themselves to be in secure possession of religious truth.* On this point there are numerous documents in which the Holy Father reaffirms the principles enunciated by his predecessors, particularly by Leo XIII.

In condemning the religious indifferentism of the State, Leo XIII, in the encyclical *Immortale Dei,* appealed to the divine law. In the encyclical *Libertas,* he appealed also to the principles of justice and of reason. In the *Immortale Dei* he makes it clear that rulers cannot "choose whatever they wish from different categories" because, as he explained, they are obliged to follow, in the matter of divine worship, those laws and those means by which God Himself has shown that He wills to be honored, "quo coli se Deus ipse demonstravit velle."[11] And in the encyclical *Libertas*

[9] *AAS,* XXXVII, 274.

[10] From the Holy Father's 1941 Christmas Radio Message, *AAS,* XXXIV, 13.

[11] *Acta Leonis XIII,* V, 123.

he continues, appealing to justice and to reason: "Justice and reason forbid a state to be atheistic or to be what comes to the same thing as being atheistic, to have the same attitude towards various, so-called 'religions' and indifferently to grant the same rights to all of them."[12]

The Pope appeals to justice and to reason because it is not just to give the same rights to good and to evil, to truth and to error. And reason rejects the notion that, in order to defer to the wishes of a small minority, the rights, the faith, and the conscience of almost all the people should be harmed, and that this people should be betrayed by permitting the enemies of its faith to bring division within it, with all the consequences of religious discord.

FIRMNESS OF THE PRINCIPLES

These principles are firm and immovable. They were valid in the times of Innocent III and Boniface VIII. They are valid in the days of Leo XIII and of Pius XII, who has reaffirmed them in more than one of his documents. Thus, with strict firmness, he has also recalled rulers to their duties, by appealing to the warning of the Holy Ghost, a warning which knows no limit of time. Pius XII speaks thus in the encyclical *Mystici Corporis:*

> We must plead with God to grant that the rulers of peoples may love wisdom, so that this severe judgment of the Holy Ghost may never fall on them: "The Most High will examine your works and search out your thoughts; because, being ministers of his kingdom, you have not judged rightly nor kept the law of justice, nor walked according to the will of God; horribly and speedily will he appear to you: for a most severe judgment shall be for them that bear rule. For to him that is little, mercy is granted: but the mighty shall be mightily tormented. For God will not except any man's person, neither will he stand in awe of any man's greatness: for he made the little and the great, and he hath equally care of all."[13]

When I refer back, then, to what I have said above about the agreement of the encyclicals in question, I am certain that no one can prove that there has been any kind of change, in the matter of these principles, between the *Summi pontificatus* of Pius XII

[12] *Acta Leonis XIII,* VIII, 231.
[13] *AAS,* XXXV, 244. The citation from Scripture is from *Wisdom* 6:4-8.

and the encyclicals of Pius XI, *Divini Redemptoris* against Communism, *Mit brennender Sorge* against Nazism, and *Non abbiamo bisogno* against the state monopoly of fascism, on the one hand; and the earlier encyclicals of Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei, Libertas,* and *Sapientiae christianae,* on the other.

"The ultimate, profound, lapidary fundamental norms of society," says the august Pontiff in his Christmas radio message of 1942, "cannot be damaged by the intervention of man's genius. Men can deny them, ignore them, despise them, disobey them, but they can never abrogate them with juridical efficacy."[14]

THE RIGHTS OF TRUTH

But now it is time to answer another question, or rather, a difficulty, so specious that at first sight it may seem insoluble.

At this point the objection is raised: you maintain two different standards or norms of action according to what is expedient for you. In a Catholic country you uphold the idea of a confessional state, with a duty of exclusive protection for the Catholic religion. On the other hand, where you constitute a minority, you claim the right to tolerance or frankly to the equality of cults. Hence for you there are two standards or two measures. This is proposed as a truly embarrassing duplicity from which those Catholics who take the actual developments of civilization into account want to be freed.

But it is not a question of that. It is a question of a different situation.

Men who perceive themselves to be in sure possession of the truth and of justice are not going to compromise. They demand full respect for their rights. How, on the other hand, can those who do not perceive themselves secure in the possession of truth claim to hold the field alone, without giving a share to the man who claims respect for his own rights on the basis of some other principle?

The concept of equality of cults and of tolerance is a product of free-thinking and of the multiplicity of religious professions. It is a logical consequence of the opinions of those men who hold, on the matter of religion, that there is no place for dogmas and

[14] *AAS,* XXXV, 13 f.

that only the conscience of individual persons may give the criterion and standard for the profession of faith and the exercise of worship. In that case, in those countries where such theories flourish, what wonder is it that the Catholic Church seeks to have an opportunity to carry out its divine mission and strives to have recognized those rights which it can claim as a logical consequence of the principles inherent in the legislation of those countries?

It would prefer to speak and to advance its claims in the name of God. But, among those peoples, the exclusiveness of its mission is not recognized. In such a case it is content to advance its claims in the name of that tolerance, of that equality, and of those common guarantees by which the legislation of the countries in question is inspired.

It ought not to be considered strange that the Church appeals at least to the rights of man, when the rights of God are not recognized.

It did this in the first centuries of Christianity, in the face of the empire and of the pagan world. It continues to do this today, especially where every religious right is denied, as in the nations under Soviet domination.

Should not the present Pontiff, in the face of the persecutions to which all Christians are subjected, and Catholics first of all, appeal to the rights of man, to tolerance, to freedom of conscience, just when there has been made so hateful a shambles of these rights?

He vindicated such rights of man in every field of individual and social life in his Christmas message of 1942, and, more recently, in the Christmas message of 1952, on the subject of the sufferings of the "Church of silence."

It is clear, then, how wrong is the attempt to spread the impression that such recognition of the rights of God and of the Church, which existed in the past, is irreconcilable with modern civilization, as if it were a retrogression to accept the just and the true that transcend any individual historical period.

The objection is made, "almost all of those who up until now have tried to meditate and to examine the problem of 'religious pluralism,' have run up against a dangerous axiom, the statement that truth alone has rights while error has none. As a matter of fact all agree today that this axiom is misleading, not because

we want to recognize any rights as belonging to error, but simply because we agree on this fundamental truth, that neither error nor truth, which are abstractions, are the objects of rights, are capable of having rights, that is of engendering mutual duties between person and person."

It seems to me, on the contrary, that the fundamental truth consists rather in this: that the rights in question have very well as their subjects those individuals who find themselves in possession of the truth; and that other individuals cannot demand the same rights by title of the error they profess.

And, in the encyclicals we have cited, it appears that the first Subject of these rights is God Himself. From this it follows that only they who obey His commands and who possess His truth and His justice have true rights.

In conclusion, the synthesis of the doctrines of the Church on this subject have been expounded most clearly in our day in the letter of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities sent to the Bishops of Brazil on March 7, 1950. This letter, which refers continually to the teachings of Pius XII, among other things warns against the errors of a renascent Catholic liberalism, which "admits and encourages the separation of the two powers. It denies to the Church any sort of direct power over mixed affairs. It affirms that the State must show itself indifferent on the subject of religion . . . and recognize the same freedom for truth and for error. To the Church belong no privileges, favors, and rights superior to those recognized as belonging to other religious confessions in Catholic countries," *etc.*

CONTRAST BETWEEN TYPES OF LEGISLATION

Now that we have considered the question under the doctrinal and juridical aspect, please let me make a little *excursus* into the practical order.

I want to speak about the difference and the disproportion between the outcry raised against the principles I have just expounded when they are acted upon in a European Catholic country and the small resentment which, on the other hand, the world of laicism has shown against the Soviet legislative system that oppresses all religion. And yet there are abundant results of that system, the martyrs who languish in concentration camps, in the

steppes of Siberia, in prisons, not counting the companies of those who with their lives and with all their blood have experienced unto the end the iniquity of that system.

Article 124 of Stalin's constitution, promulgated in 1936, and intimately conected with the laws on religious associations of the years 1929 and 1932, reads as follows:

> To the end that the citizens may be assured freedom of conscience, the Church is separated from the state and the school from the Church. Freedom of religious profession and freedom of antireligious propaganda are recognized for all the citizens.

Leaving aside the offense committed against God, against all religion, and against the consciences of believers, in the Constitution's guarantee of complete freedom for antireligious propaganda, a propaganda which is exercised in the most licentious manner, it will be a good thing to bring out clearly the nature of that famous liberty of faith guaranteed by the bolshevistic law.

The existing norms that regulate the exercise of cults were put together in the law of May 18, 1929, which interprets the corresponding article of the 1918 constitution, and in the spirit of which article 124 of the present constitution was formed. This denies all possibility of religious propaganda and guarantees only antireligious propaganda. As far as worship itself is concerned, this is allowed only inside the church buildings. All possibility of religious formation is forbidden, whether by way of discourses or through the press, in journals, books, pamphlets, and the like. All social and charitable initiative is blocked, and the organizations that are inspired by these ideals are deprived of every fundamental right to expend themselves for the well-being of their neighbors.

In proof of all of this, it is enough to read the summary explanation of this condition of affairs given by a Soviet Russian, Orleansky, in his work on "The Laws on Religious Associations in the Socialist, Federal, Soviet, Russian Republic."[15]

> Liberty of religious profession means that the action of believers in the profession of their own religious dogmas is limited to the believers' sphere itself, and is considered as bound up strictly with the religious worship of one or the other of the religions tolerated in our

[15] The book was published in Moscow in 1930. The citation is from p. 224.

state. . . . Consequently, all propagandistic or hortative activity on the part of churchmen or of religious—and *a fortiori* of missionaries—cannot be considered as activity permitted to them by the laws on religious associations, but is considered as going beyond the bounds of the religious freedom protected by the laws. It becomes, therefore, the object of penal and civil laws, insofar as it is opposed to these laws.

WITHIN THE TEMPLE AND OUTSIDE THE TEMPLE

Here is a last question which is very practical. I want to deal with the pretext of those who wish to determine, on their own judgment or in the light of their own theories, the sphere of the action and the competence of the Church, so as to be able to accuse it of passing beyond that sphere, to accuse it of acting as a political institution.

It is the pretext of all those who would like to enclose the Church within the four walls of the temple, by separating religion from life, the Church from the world.

Now the Church must act in accordance with the divine commands, rather than in accord with the pretexts of men. "Preach the gospel to every creature."[16] And the Gospel refers to the entire revealed message, with all the implications it carries for man's moral conduct, with regard to his individual life, to his domestic and social life, to his public life, and also to his political life, using "political" in the sense of what has to do with the well-being of the *polis*.

The august Pontiff tells us:

> Religion and morality in their intimate union constitute an indivisible whole. The moral order, the commandments of God, are equally valid throughout the entire field of human activity. There is no exception. And as far as these reach out, there extends also the mission of the Church, and therefore also the word of the priest, his teaching, his admonitions, and his counsels to the faithful confided to his care.
>
> The Catholic Church will never let itself be shut up within the four walls of the temple.
>
> The separation between religion and life, between the Church and the world, is contrary to the Christian and Catholic idea.

Specifically, and with apostolic firmness, the Holy Father continues:

[16] *Mark* 16:15.

> The exercise of the right to vote is an act of grave moral responsibility, at least when there is a question of electing the men who are called upon to give the country its constitution and its laws, especially those laws which have to do with the sanctification of holy days, marriage, the family, the school, and the equitable regulation of many social conditions. It is therefore the Church's task to explain to the faithful the moral duties that come from that right to vote.[17]

This is the truth which, not for any desire of worldly advantage, nor for the sake of depriving civil society of that power which the Church cannot and must not desire for itself (for we must remember that "He who gives heavenly kingdoms does not take away earthly ones"), but only for the reign of Christ, so that there may be "The Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ," the Church unceasingly preaches, teaches, and fights for until final victory.

For this truth the Church suffers, mourns, and pours out her blood.

I do not believe that I can offer a better homage to the august Pontiff, on the happy anniversary that the Pontifical Lateran University celebrates today, than by concluding this solemn convocation with a repetition of the masterly teaching which he gave to the Catholic world in his Christmas discourse of 1941.

"We behold today, beloved sons, the God-Man, born in a cave so that He might raise man up to the greatness from which he had fallen by his own fault, to put him back again on the throne of freedom, justice and honor which centuries of false gods had denied him. The foundation of that throne will be Calvary. Its ornament will not be gold or silver, but the blood of Christ, divine blood, which for twenty centuries has poured forth on the world and which has reddened the cheeks of His Spouse, the Church, and purifying, consecrating, sanctifying, and glorifying the children of the Church, becomes the brightness of heaven. O Christian Rome, this blood is thy life!"[18]

ALFREDO CARDINAL OTTAVIANI

[17] From the Holy Father's Lenten Discourse to the Parish Priests and the Lenten Preachers of Rome in 1946, *AAS*, XXXVIII, 187.

[18] *AAS*, XXXIV, 19 f.

ST. IGNATIUS' LETTER ON OBEDIENCE: 1553-1953

St. Ignatius' *Letter on Obedience* which he wrote to the Jesuits in Portugal on March 26, 1553, is justly regarded as "the most admirable of all the letters which came from his pen."[1] In the four centuries since its composition, the letter has been translated into all the major languages in use in modern times. Its teaching is not only "the backbone of the Society of Jesus," but it has become the classic exposition of perfect obedience for most of the religious orders and congregations that have arisen in the Church in the past four hundred years. However, as much as the ideals which it presents have been praised by the Church and admired by unprejudiced historians, there is perhaps no other piece of Jesuit writing that has been more frequently misunderstood or bitterly attacked than the *Epistola de virtute obedientiae.*

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS OF THE LETTER ON OBEDIENCE

The *Letter on Obedience* was called forth by the gravest internal disturbances which St. Ignatius had to face in the government of his nascent order. The difficulties were caused by the conduct of certain Portuguese religious whose lack of proper training brought them into conflict with superiors. They presumed to pass judgment on the orders of obedience, and showed by their words and actions such disrespect for authority that the very existence of the Society in Portugal was seriously threatened. The situation became so critical that before it was finally settled, one hundred and thirty members in various grades had left the order in that country or were dismissed. One of the main factors which contributed to solving this problem was St. Ignatius' *Letter on Obedience.*

The full text of the Letter is approximately 4000 words in length in the original Spanish. St. Ignatius' autograph has no paragraph or number divisions, but the official text used is divided into twenty-one paragraphs of unequal length; the whole Letter possessing a remarkable organic unity and logical sequence, as indicated in the following summary of contents:

[1] Antonio Astrain, *Historia de la Compania de Jesus en la asistencia de Espana,* I (Madrid, 1912), 611.

I. *Value and Dignity of Obedience.*

1. Highly praised in the Old and New Testaments.
2. Obedience is the source and protection of all other virtues.
3. Obedience is the distinctive mark of the Society of Jesus.

II. *Motives for the Practice of Obedience.*

1. From reason: God's supreme dominion over all creation. Consequently the superior is in the place of God.
2. From revelation: Christ established a hierarchy in His Church. Consequently the superior is in the place of Christ.

III. *Three Degrees of Obedience.*

A. First Degree: *External* execution of the command.

B. Second Degree: *Internal* conformity of *will* with superior.

1. Includes everything, also sacred things like penances, etc.
2. Means sacrifice of our will to God.
3. Allows of no intrusion of self-will.

C. Third Degree: *Internal* conformity of *mind* with superior.

1. Possible because the will can command the intellect.
2. Necessary to receive supernatural influence from superior.
3. Necessary to keep the intellect from going astray.
4. Necessary to assure the first two degrees of obedience.
5. Necessary to maintain unity in every society.
6. Pleasing to God since both will and intellect consecrated to Him.

IV. *Method of Acquiring Perfect Obedience.*

A. In General: Deep humility and meekness of soul.

B. In Particular:

1. See Jesus Christ in every superior.
2. Defend in your mind whatever the superior commands.
3. Accept the superior's orders with the same unquestioning, hence blind, obedience which is given to God Himself.

V. *Practical Recommendations*

1. Humble representation to superior is not contrary to obedience.

2. Perfect obedience applies to subjects and superiors, hierarchically terminating in the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ.
3. The ultimate motive for this virtue is the love of Christ, the great Teacher and Model of perfect obedience.

THE TRIBUTE OF THE SAINTS

The highest tribute to St. Ignatius' *Letter on Obedience* has been paid by the saints who generously put into literal practice the principles which it enjoins. The first outstanding example is St. Francis Borgia, former Duke of Gandia and great-grandson of Pope Alexander VI. As General of the Society of Jesus, in 1565 he exhorted his subjects throughout the world to the practice of perfect obedience, but declined to expand further on the subject in deference to the famous epistle of his predecessor. "I refer you," he told them, "to the excellent and admirable letter which our Father Ignatius has written on that virtue. He has said all, and left nothing more to be said. 'Hoc fac et vives.' "[2]

Little did he suspect that three years later he would himself be called upon to put the prescriptions of that letter into heroic practice—as events proved, at the cost of his life.

In 1571, St. Pius V ordered Francis to go to Spain in the interests of the Crusade which the Pope was organizing against the Turks. Francis' brethren pleaded with the Holy Father to spare their General the journey from Rome to Madrid. "It seems impossible," his secretary told the Pope, "that Father Francis with his weak and broken health will ever survive it." But the Pope felt that the greater good of the Church required this sacrifice. Francis accepted the assignment cheerfully. To those who ventured to express their admiration of his obedience he replied, "I have always found that God has been mercifully pleased to make easy for me the most difficult and painful things, when I have undertaken them in the true spirit of obedience. However much suffering this journey may cost me, the consciousness that I am fulfilling the will of God and of His Vicar on earth, will cause me far greater joy."[3] Francis Borgia successfully performed his mis-

[2] *Monumenta historica S.J., S. Franciscus Borgia,* V (Madrid, 1912), 80.
[3] A. M. Clarke, *St. Francis Borgia* (London, 1913), p. 398.

sion to Spain. But he was brought back to Italy a dying man; living only two days after his return to Rome, a martyr of obedience, as the Church herself recognizes in the Breviary lesson for his feast.[4]

St. Alphonsus Rodriguez was a lay brother at the College of Majorca, off the coast of Spain, faithful to his post of doorkeeper for thirty-seven years. Gifted with the highest mystical graces, his outstanding virtue was obedience, that was sometimes so literal it had to be defended in the process of canonization as an extraordinary grace of God.

Under orders from superiors, Alphonsus wrote a number of treatises on the spiritual life, among which is a commentary on the *Letter on Obedience*. He recognized two degrees of obedience within the third degree of St. Ignatius:

> The second degree of this lofty obedience of the understanding is that the soul perceives in the commands of obedience not only the voice of God, but it goes farther, because it lives wholly on fire with the love of God whom it obeys.[5]

What this meant for Alphonsus may be seen from the holy extravagances to which his love of obedience led him. He would remain seated for hours without moving, because told to sit down; told to say a word or two to a guest, he said, "Deo Gratias" and left; told to eat "a mouthful" for breakfast, he took exactly one mouthful and no more; told to eat the whole dish of soup given him, he ate the soup and then began scraping the dish itself to eat it. By nature a man of great prudence, he owned that these "follies of obedience" may not be followed except under the special inspiration of God, who thus tries and humbles His servants.

St. John Berchmans, the heavenly patron of altar boys and "the saint of religious observance," is known to have read and studied the *Letter on Obedience* even before entering religion. According to his biographers, it was especially the inspiration which he derived from this treatise that led him to the heights of sanctity. In the novitiate he drew up a series of maxims for himself, concen-

[4] "Cardinali Alexandrino, ad conjungendos contra Turcas christianos principes, legato comes additus a beato Pio quinto, arduum iter, fractis jam pene viribus, suscepit ex obedientia; in qua et vitae cursum Romae, ut optarat, feliciter consummavit." Lect. VI, Noct. II, Oct. 10.

[5] *Obras spirituales,* edit. Nonell, III (Barcelona, 1885), 390.

trating on the practice of obedience. "Obey even in the smallest things," he wrote. "Obedience in these is a preparation for what will be required in important affairs later on." Eager to imitate his saintly brethren, Stanislaus and Aloysius, he added, "If Blessed Aloysius and Stanislaus were obedient to the very letter, it was not for fear of being guilty of a fault by acting otherwise, but out of pure love of virtue."[6]

One sentence in the Brief of Beatification summarizes the perfection of John's obedience: "He observed and guarded with the greatest care the slightest rules of religious discipline." Moreover, with penetrating insight he had distinguished what was most imitable in Aloysius and Stanislaus—their obedience, with the result that "John brought the virtues of the other two saints more within the reach of everyone's imitation. Without doing anything extraordinary, as far as eye could see, he reached the highest perfection."[7]

VINDICATION OF THE LETTER ON OBEDIENCE

Within thirty-five years of its composition, the *Letter on Obedience* precipitated a crisis that for a time threatened the distinctive character and almost the very existence of the Society of Jesus.

A certain Father Julian Vincent, restless and eccentric professor at the College of Bordeaux, had some misunderstanding with superiors, which caused them to impose on him the salutary penance of a pilgrimage to St. James of Compostela in Spain. Vincent made the pilgrimage, but then instead of returning to France, and without a word to superiors, set out for Rome. In Rome he was sent to the Novitiate of San Andrea, where he used his leisure time to write a lengthy denunciation of the Society to the Holy Office, centering his attacks on the *Letter on Obedience*. He drew up a list of twelve indictments of the "blind obedience" counselled by St. Ignatius, and reached the bizarre conclusion that by such obedience to his religious superiors, a subject necessarily attributed to them personal infallibility, thus derogating from a prerogative which belonged only to the Pope.

Pope Sixtus V promptly took a hand in the matter. He had the Jesuit General Aquaviva cross-examined before a commission,

[6] Francis Goldie, *St. John Berchmans* (London, 1873), p. 76.
[7] *Bulla canonizationis, ASS,* XX, 356.

which returned an unfavorable verdict, and all indications pointed to a condemnation of the blind obedience as taught by St. Ignatius and as interpreted by his disciples.

At this critical moment, Robert Bellarmine was appointed to write a defense of St. Ignatius' Letter, which he did in such masterly fashion that it remains to this day a "theological epitome of religious obedience." Since the center of attack was on blind obedience, Bellarmine limited himself to this concept, proving in a series of five chapters that *obedientia caeca* is as old as Christianity and perfectly consonant with the Catholic Faith. Several points in the apologia are specially worth noting: the clear definition of "blind obedience," the Patristic evidence in its defense, and Bellarmine's favorite "argument from analogy."

At the outset, St. Robert explains that "the name 'blind obedience' means nothing else than obedience which is pure, perfect, and simple, with no discussion of what is commanded or why, but remaining satisfied that a command had been given."[8]

In Patristic support of this virtue, Bellarmine traces the exact places where St. Ignatius found his arguments, illustrations and examples. The term "blind obedience" was explicitly used by at least two great leaders of Christian monasticism, John Climacus and St. Bernard. Climacus says that, "The Lord gives His light to the *blindly obedient,* to see the virtue of their superior, and mercifully hides from them his faults."[9] And St. Bernard describes perfect obedience as "a *blessed blindness,* by which the eyes of those who once were sinners, are now happily shielded from the dazzling glare of sin."[10]

But even without using the expression *caeca obedientia,* the Fathers of monasticism from the earliest centuries described its equivalent whenever they spoke of the perfection of this virtue. Thus St. Augustine:

[8] "Tractatus de obedientia," in *Auctarium Bellarminianum,* ed. Le Bachelet (Paris, 1913), p. 377.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 380. The text occurs in the treatise, *Scala Paradisi,* of St. John Climacus (*MPG,* 88, 715).

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 381. The text occurs in the treatise, *De Praecepto et Dispensatione,* which St. Bernard wrote to a certain Abbot Columban who asked for advice with regard to the practice of religious obedience (*MPL,* 182, 871).

For religious obedience to be pleasing to God, it must be prompt without delay, faithful without servility, willing without complaint, simple without discussion, constant without cessation, orderly with no deviation, joyous without perturbance, strenuous without scrupulosity, and universal with no exception. For in the measure that we listen to our superiors, God will also listen to our prayers.[11]

Bellarmine concludes in typical controversial style by answering the most serious objection which even Catholics sometimes make to the blind obedience of religious. "It is dangerous," the argument runs, "for religious to trust their superiors so blindly, because the latter as fallible men are often mistaken, and therefore what began as obedience may end as a widely propagated error, or even as heresy."

The St. Robert answers the objections with a parallel situation that exists in the Church as a whole:

If the danger in question is to be measured by the obedience of religious, much more should it be measured by the obedience of the simple people, who listen to their pastors or bishops preaching publicly and with all the *adjuncta* of authority. For although the people take no vow of obedience to their pastors or bishops, they are still bound to obey them according to the teaching of St. Paul. So that, willing or not, they have to render them blind obedience and credence in those things which are not obvious to them already. Of course it can happen that a bishop or priest may be a secret heretic, trying to seduce the people and propagate his heresy. But God Himself and the vigilance of other pastors of souls will not permit this to go on for very long before it is properly referred to the judgment of the Holy See. Moreover, even though somewhere, by God's permission, a credulous people should be easily seduced by their pastor, no Catholic would dare say that therefore the people should be discouraged from obeying their prelates, or should themselves become judges of their pastors, and decide on the doctrine that is being preached to them. We know from present experience among the Lutherans that the danger of heresy is far greater by making this kind of concession to human liberty, than it will ever be from the simple obedience of the people. . . . Consequently, if the ordinary faithful must simply trust their pastors in the

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 380. The text is quoted by Bellarmine as a citation from St. Bonaventure. It occurs in the latter's *Collationes Octo*, cap. III, *Opera*, XIV (Paris, 1868), 643. Bonaventure attributes the text to St. Augustine but without giving the exact source.

things which appertain to God, and render them corresponding obedience and respect, much more should religious obey and be subject to their superiors, perfectly and simply, and *in that sense* blindly, in whatever does not manifestly contravene the law of God.[12]

It should be added that Bellarmine's defense of Ignatius' obedience had the desired effect. The Holy See dismissed the charges against the Society and ignored the fulminations of Père Vincent, who was himself hailed before the Inquisition and died shortly after, in prison, giving unmistakable signs of insanity.

MODERN CRITICS OF THE LETTER ON OBEDIENCE

An instructive catalog could be made of the critical opinions which modern historians and psychologists have expressed regarding the *Letter on Obedience.* At one extreme is a polemic like *The Jesuits in Great Britain,* which runs through 358 pages of scurrilous abuse of the Society of Jesus. Treating of "Blind Obedience, Crime and Folly," the author comments on the Letter of 1553:

> What if the superior be a wicked man? Is it not probable, in this case, that he will, from time to time, relying on the Blind Obedience of his subject, order him to commit that which is sinful? In this case, how can his subject see anything wrong in the command, when he is required to obey it "without examining anything, without seeing anything"? The fact is that Blind Obedience would justify, and even make a merit of, doing any crime which a superior may command.
>
> Blind Obedience facilitates not only crime and tyranny, but also folly, sometimes of the most ridiculous kind. It would be easy to multiply instances in proof of this. The case of Alonzo Rodriguez may suffice. It is recorded of him that he was so perfect in Blind Obedience that he used to obey "without reasoning." Here is another instance which shows into what folly such obedience may lead.[13]

And then follows the story of St. Alphonsus and the dish alluded to above. The author concludes with the suggestion that, "This Blind Obedience should never be given to any man, or body of men."[14]

[12] *Ibid.,* p. 385.

[13] Walter Walsh, *The Jesuits in Great Britain,* "An Historical Inquiry into their Political Influence" (London, 1903), pp. 298-99.

[14] *Ibid.*

On the other hand, William James, in the lectures which he gave at the University of Edinburgh and later published as *Varieties of Religious Experience,* is not so much critical of the *Letter on Obedience* as simply mystified by it.

First several pages on the "morbid melancholy and fear" of the saints, "and the sacrifices made to purge out sin and to buy safety." Then a disquisition on obedience, the most important of the "three minor branches of mortification [considered] as indispensable pathways to perfection."

In treating of obedience, James concentrates on the letters of St. Ignatius on the subject. "One should read," he says, "the letters in which St. Ignatius Loyola recommends obedience . . . if one would gain insight into the full spirit of its cult."[15] He is puzzled by the idea of perfect obedience, but at least he tries to understand it. And in the attempt, he comes very close to a correct appraisal of the modern attitude on this virtue:

> The secular life of our twentieth century opens with this virtue held in no high esteem. The duty of the individual to determine his own conduct and profit or suffer by the consequences seems, on the contrary, to be one of our best rooted contemporary social ideals. So much so that it is difficult even imaginatively to comprehend how men possessed of an inner life of their own, could ever have come to think the subjection of its will to that of other finite creatures recommendable. I confess that to myself it seems something of a mystery. Yet it evidently corresponds to a profound interior need of many persons, and we must do our best to understand it.[16]

After a careful analysis of this strange phenomenon of "blind obedience," he suggests that:

> Obedience may spring from the general religious phenomenon of inner softening and self surrender and throwing one's self on higher

---

[15] William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York, 1936), p. 307. It should be noted that St. Ignatius wrote at least three other letters on the subject of obedience: to the College of Gandia in Spain, July 29, 1547; to the Society in Portugal, Jan. 14, 1548; and to the Rector of Gandia, March 27, 1548. However, the letter of 1553 remains as the most authoritative. Its public reading to the community every month is prescribed by Jesuit rule. Cf. Espinosa Polit, *Perfect Obedience* (Westminster, Md., 1947), pp. 17-18.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

powers. So saving are these attitudes felt to be that in themselves, apart from utility, they become ideally consecrated; and in obeying a man whose fallibility we see through thoroughly, we, nevertheless, may feel much as we do when we resign our will to that of infinite wisdom.[17]

If James had believed in a personal Deity for whose sake man is obeyed, religious obedience might still have remained "something of a mystery" to him psychologically; but at least he would not have concluded that the practice of this virtue in a high degree is a pathological phenomenon, technically called "ascetic sacrifice," which is a compound of "fatigued nerves . . . self despair and the passion of self crucifixion."[18]

Apparently more objective but equally hostile was the treatment given the Letter in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* up to its eleventh edition, under the title "Jesuits." A curious mixture of truth and exaggeration, it was one of the main reasons why the article was finally (1936) removed from the *Britannica:*

> In this letter, Ignatius clothes the general with the powers of a commander-in-chief in time of war, giving him the absolute disposal of all members of the Society in every place and for every purpose.... This *Letter on Obedience* was written for the guidance and formation of Ignatius' own followers; it was an entirely domestic affair. But when it became known outside the Society, the teaching met with great opposition, especially from members of other orders whose institutes represented the normal days of peace rather than war. The Letter was condemned by the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal; and it tasked all the skill and learning of Bellarmine as its apologist, together with the whole influence of the Society to avert what seemed to be a probable condemnation at Rome.[19]

The *Britannica* article adds a number of other details on the *Letter on Obedience*. But even in the pericope quoted, there are at least three mis-statements of fact. There was no question of Ignatius clothing "the general with the powers of a commander-in-chief in time of war." The obedience which he required of his subjects was to be spontaneous and motivated by love, the very opposite of the martial subjection fabricated by the *Encyclopedia*. Also there is no evidence that the opposition to the Society of

[17] *Ibid.*
[18] *Ibid.*
[19] *Encyclopedia Britannica,* 11th ed., XV, 338.

Jesus, such as it was, came from "other orders whose institutes represented the normal days of peace rather than war." Finally, to say that the Letter was condemned by the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal is a literary expansion on the story of Père Vincent, as described in the previous section.

POPE PIUS XI AND IGNATIAN OBEDIENCE

In marked contrast to this hostility and misinterpretation, Catholic and non-Catholic biographers and historians have been generally friendly and even lavish in their praise of St. Ignatius' concept of obedience as embodied in the Letter of 1553. Writes a French historian:

> On reading this Letter from beginning to end, examining it as a whole, weighing its firm and solemn tone, the mastery of its thought, the pertinence of its arguments, the rigorous sequence, the sober splendor of the reasoning, one gets the impression that here, if anywhere, is the definitive code of religious obedience.[20]

But more valuable than any private opinion on the subject is the declaration of Pope Pius XI that "this was the special gift of God to Ignatius: to lead men back to the practice of the virtue of obedience."[21] Viewed against this authoritative statement, the *Letter on Obedience* takes on an entirely new significance. No longer just a private document for one religious family or only for the cloister, it becomes a supernatural weapon to overcome the forces of evil that would destroy the Church in our own day, as in the time of St. Ignatius.

On the one hand, says the Holy Father, "It is well known into what kind of world it was the lot of St. Ignatius to be cast. It is no less evident that the principal cause of all the evils by which the Church was afflicted, was in great part the refusal of men to serve and obey Almighty God" in submission to the Church which Christ had founded.[22]

[20] Gaetan De Bernoville, *The Jesuits* (English transl., London, 1937), p. 84

[21] "Qui rem penitus perscrutetur, facile reperiet insignem in Ignatio fuisse obedientiae spiritum, eique tamquam proprium munus assignatum a Deo, ut ad hanc ipsam virtutem maiore studio colendam homines adduceret." *Epistola Apostolica,* Third Cent. of the Canonization of St. Ignatius, Dec. 3, 1923, *AAS,* XIV, 628.

[22] *Ibid.*

On the other hand, "if We seek for the origin of the evils from which the human race is suffering today, We must admit that they undoubtedly sprang from the revolt against the divine authority of the Church started by the Reformers."[23]

The remedy offered by the Church in the sixteenth century was the practice of humble obedience. The remedy recommended by the Church today is again obedience, heroic if need be, by those chosen souls, lay and clerical, who would give the good example and make reparation to Almighty God for the crimes of disobedience. And among the best teachers of obedience that we may follow, as the Vicar of Christ suggests, is St. Ignatius, whose Letter of 1553 is a perfect synthesis of his doctrine on this virtue.

JOHN A. HARDON, S.J.

West Baden College
West Baden Springs, Ind.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 630-31.

PIONEERS

Now there are some who, passing, say
the pioneers have long since gone;
but those who find a step on snow
vow that these folk still tarry on.

When pleats of limey velvet drape
a country road or city street,
the children come in fairy-file
and break a trail with elfin feet.

Where snow lies at a soul's closed door—
a pathless white that warms and cheers—
the priests who make their footfall heard
are pioneers, are pioneers.

RAYMOND ROSELIEP

SAINT THOMAS AND OUR LADY'S ASSUMPTION

St. Thomas Aquinas, as we can learn from the Apostolic Constitution *Munificentissimus Deus,* never dealt directly with the question of the Blessed Virgin's Assumption, though he did in fact hold, together with the Catholic Church, that Mary's body had been assumed into heaven along with her soul.

St. Thomas does, however, deal with the question of the state in heaven of a soul not yet rejoined to that body for union with which it was created in the first place. His significant statement is that before the resurrection of the body the soul does not lack perfect happiness *intensively* but does lack it *extensively.*[1]

From that proposition there follows perfectly the same argument, cited in the *Munificentissimus Deus,* that St. Bonaventure uses: "The soul is not a person, but the soul joined to the body is a person. It is manifest that she is there in soul and body. Otherwise she would not possess her complete beatitude."

St. Thomas' argument is as follows. Beatitude in this life consists in the operation of the speculative or of the practical intellect. There is no question, then, whether the soul needs the body for beatitude in this life; for without the light of glory there is no "imageless thought," and the intellect here below needs for its operation those images which only the body can supply.

Perfect beatitude in heaven, of course, says St. Thomas, is a different matter. For there happiness consists in the vision of the First Cause as He is in His essence; and it is manifest that the divine essence cannot be seen through images. It must be admitted, therefore, that the body plays no constitutive part in the essence of our happiness in heaven.

On the other hand, however, St. Thomas says, that which does not pertain to the *esse* of something may still pertain to its *bene esse.* It is thus, for example, that handsomeness contributes to the perfection of the body. And it is thus that the presence of the body contributes to the perfection of the soul's happiness in heaven.

This contribution the Angelic Doctor explains further. Lack of the body will not directly hinder the perfection of the soul's

[1] *Sum. theol.,* I-II, q. 4, a. 5.

happiness as cold draughts directly reduce the efficiency of a heating system. But the lack of the body will keep the soul from having something which is required for a certain *variety* of perfection in its happiness. And so, he says, the separation of the soul from its body will constitute a situation that is said to tug at the soul, so that the soul's *whole* attention is not centered upon the sight of the divine essence. For we shall long to enjoy God in such a fashion that our enjoyment overflows our souls and is passed along to our bodies. And, therefore, so long as we are enjoying God without our bodies, our longing does find rest in Him, but in this way: that our souls still would like our bodies to have the bodies' share.

The soul, as St. Thomas explains in other words, will possess the good which is perfectly capable of satisfying its longing, yet the soul will not be perfectly at rest, for it will not possess that good in every way that it is possible for it to possess it. It will not yet have *all* the perfection of happiness which it is going to to have.

Seen now in the light of the solemn definition of Our Lady's Assumption, what St. Thomas has to say about the relationship of soul and body in heaven puts us in a position to understand in greater particularity the benefit which Almighty God has conferred upon His Mother by taking her, not soul alone but body also, to heaven. It is not only true that the Assumption has prevented the body that bore Christ from undergoing the corruption of the grave; it is also arguable, from the principles of St. Thomas, that the Assumption has saved the Blessed Virgin from an unbecoming diminution of her happiness and from an equally unbecoming defect in her attention to her Son in heaven.

Though the *Munificentissimus Deus* directly intends to define the dogma of the Assumption, it also tends to bring into new relief another article of our faith, namely, the common resurrection of the body.

We sometimes hear such misleading and incomplete statements as this: "All things upon the face of the earth will eventually crumble to dust and be forgotten. But man's immortal soul will never die." It is true that human bodies will die and crumble to dust. Measured by eternity, however, that death is but momentary; human bodies will rise and will share the immortality of their

souls. Meanwhile, far from being forgotten, those bodies will be intensely remembered and wished for by the blessed souls to which, at last, they will be rejoined, not only to share in the souls' happiness but even extensively to increase it.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the body, then, finally, to which we have been incidentally but quite deliberately redirected by the definition of the dogma of the Assumption, can be further understood and appreciated in the light of St. Thomas' teaching on the happiness souls possess before being rejoined to their bodies. In that light we can see on the one hand the "necessity," so to speak, of our own resurrection as well as of the Blessed Virgin's Assumption, and, on the other hand, the greatest dignity of our bodies—those bodies which, having partaken here below of the most Holy Eucharist, will contribute by their wanted presence in that joy wherein we like the Virgin will contemplate the glory of the most Holy Trinity for all eternity.

WILLIAM J. KERRIGAN

Ottumwa Heights College
Ottumwa, Iowa

REQUIEM FOR A PRIEST

My brother once, alive;
now, brother twice:
this is your requiem,
my sacrifice—

the selfsame rosy depth
in which you stood,
our common claim to Love
and brotherhood.

RAYMOND ROSELIEP

MORAL ASPECTS OF INFLATION

Inflation is a timely topic. It is not an ephemeral characteristic, but a perennial problem. It is a weakness inherent in capitalistic economics, liable to break out at any time, and, like all economic factors, a moral issue. We know, of course, that economics and economic developments are moral issues in themselves and in their circumstances. Yet, so ingrained are the identification of the economic structure with the American notion of culture—particularly in what Mark Twain and H. L. Mencken termed "The Guilded Age"—and the practical separation of business from ethics, that insofar as economics is, in itself, a good thing, we may be apt to overlook the moral issues involved in the economic set-up. True, we appreciate the social encyclicals and strive to put their recommendations into practice. Yet, so often, we limit their scope to labor-management relations. So often do we take for granted that business proceeds in a cycle of good times, depression, and inflation, that we sometimes fail to realize that there must be something wrong with a system that is so regularly erratic. And, since this system so intimately touches man's moral right to ownership, we must realize in practice that there are deep moral issues involved in both the circumstances and the essence of industrialism.

The moral issues involved in the circumstances of industrialism and capitalism are apparent. We have only to look at the history of industrialism and capitalism to see a wake of evils in their train. These are not evils intrinsic to industrialism, but they are opportunities occasioned by industrialism for evil. They are, for example, the concentration of workers into crowded districts which soon become slums. Slums had existed before industrialism in metropolitan serfdom, but never on such a wide scale as that consequent to the erection of industrial settlements. In this concentration of people, robbery has become easier. In the crowding of many people of both sexes into squalid surroundings, in the psychological desire for compensation for poor living, we find the ready opportunity and motive for sexual promiscuity and juvenile delinquency, as well as the proffered motives for birth control.

Yet the above are evils circumstantial to capitalism. Inflation is an evil inherent to it, and, as such, is a severe reflection upon industrial economics insofar as it defeats the one valid assurance of

industrialism, which is the ready production and distribution of real assets to the members of society. Social living and the economic system which is such a large part of it have become so complex that we are indeed far from the fundamentals of our social economy. Fundamentally, economics, any economic system, is founded upon real assets. Real assets are what St. Thomas calls material goods absolutely and secondarily necessary for man's bodily sustenance. For all practical purposes, they are food, shelter (housing and clothing), the means for the same, and those comforts which go into the fulfillment of a given state of life.

There have been times in the history of most peoples when men have lived simple lives, when cultures have been largely agrarian or nomadic. However, even in simplest conditions, men have always carried on some sort of trade or commerce. It is extremely difficult for one man to provide the basic necessities for himself and still live in society as he should. He has neither the natural resources nor the means of processing and refining them. The history of economic specialization—division of labor—is parallel to the history of culture. After all, God gave man ingenuity, and man compliments God by using his ingenuity to save himself unnecessary toil.

Hence, we find, even in a simple economy, a simple division of labor. There is, for example, the farmer who supplies the miller with grain that he may save himself the toil of milling his own wheat. Similarly, we find the miller depending upon the blacksmith for his tools, and paying the blacksmith in flour. Even the intellectual life becomes a part of such a simple economy. At all times we have had the learned man, whether the bard of ancient and medieval times, the hedge schoolmaster of Ireland, or the travelling schoolteacher in frontier America, trading his knowledge for sustenance and visiting from home to home, there to remain for a matter of days or weeks, living with the householder and his family, and, in exchange, teaching his children.

However, in its simplest, we find the fact of a basic economy both supposing many other economic factors and unable to subsist without them. At all times, ownership of land is required. Real assets are fundamentally food and shelter. All of our food and shelter comes from the land, either immediately or mediately. All of our food is either vegetable or animal, and, obviously, the ownership of both requires the dominance or ownership of land either

for agrarian or for grazing purposes. This dominance of land may be either private ownership or communal use of the public domain, as, for example, in the case of nomadic American Indian tribes. Shelter, too, whether clothing or housing, ultimately comes from the land. Clothing itself is from the cellulose of vegetable fiber, animal fiber, and today from artificial cellulose manufactured both out of vegetable fiber (viscose rayon) and out of minerals (nylon, for example, a product of complex combinations of the carbon molecule). Molecular experiments have given us clothing from glass. Similarly, shelter is either from wood, stone, or metal. In every case, to procure the raw materials for clothing, shelter, and heat, there must be possession of land involved, so that, ultimately, man's real assets are involved, either proximately or remotely, in the possession of land, the source of raw materials for real assets. That is, moreover, the reason why warfare hinges about either the actual conquest of land or the setting up of strategic positions to guarantee the potential conquest of land, since a nation's real wealth is not its gold, but its natural resources. That is, furthermore, the weakness of present day credit economics, namely, that possession of real assets without the actual possession of land, their source, leaves the consumer dependent upon those who may manipulate prices to suit their whims.

In a basic economy, there are natural and naturally complicated developments of the fundamental possession of real assets. These are manufacture, distribution, and finance.

Manufacture is almost as necessary as cooking. There are so many items which man cannot use in the raw state. For clothing, the skins of animals must be treated, plant fibers must be spun, metal tools must be forged after the ore has been refined. Man has the mental ingenuity to observe, make discoveries, and to pursue these discoveries with inventive genius. Hence, in the history of culture, we find that invention and discovery are first utilized to make easier the wresting of a living from the land. Hence, among almost all primitive peoples, we find a natural inventive development. We find primitive forges, frames for spinning cloth, means of manufacturing flour. Naturally, the man with inventive genius would specialize, and would be paid off in food and various raw materials.

Distribution of goods flows naturally enough from specialized division of labor and the specialization introduced by manufacture.

Taking advantage of such natural distributing routes as rivers, streams, and other natural highways, man opened up the possibility of trade routes. Since natural highways do not exist everywhere, there grew a concentration of population near river ports, sea coasts, etc. Since commerce and manufacturing are mutually beneficial, we find the opening of trade routes allowing for the importation of new raw materials, which in turn are exported, all contributing to the mutual benefit of importer and exporter. Although, naturally, we do not agree with Karl Marx or with Charles Beard that the sole motif of history is the economic one, we do admit that economic development has played a great part in the development of post-medieval civilization. The Crusaders opened a new world of commerce, and this, in turn, initiated a new era of exploration, culminating in the discovery of the New World.

Manufacturing and commerce, means for the distribution of real assets, depending upon trade for their vitality, are crippled without a ready means of exchange. This requires a sound fiscal system. Trading is too bulky, credit often shaky. Hence, there must be a common medium which is at once sufficiently desirable because of its intrinsic worth, and, at the same time, sufficiently rare to preserve its novelty. It must, furthermore, be sufficiently easy to process, so that its refining does not out-cost its utility. For this, gold is unique. Among the metals, it has the intrinsic worth desired. It is not nearly as bulky as iron and other such metals. It is sufficiently rare, and, among the rare metals, it is not as difficult to process as other such metals, like platinum. Furthermore, the desirable qualities mentioned above give it preference as a means of exchange over precious gems. It is to be noted, though, that the special value of gold is more in its value as a ready and serviceable means of exchange than in its intrinsic worth. This means that the fundamental value of gold in an economic system is its value as a representative of real assets, *not* its value in itself. Paper money as a means of exchange came to the fore with the high pressure economic boom subsequent to the rapid progress of mass production simultaneous with the discovery of the machine.

The invention of the machine, together with new explorations, resulted in a startling change. True, it did provide man with a sufficiency of goods in abundance, but it also brought to predominance the ever-present profit motive. There is, of course, a legitimate desire for profit on the part of the industrialist. He must

price his goods according to the costs of production and transportation, as also according to a profit sufficient both to cover the risk of his venture and to provide him with the necessities and comforts of his state in life. However, the discovery of the machine provided almost unlimited production, and when his market was satisfied, he was forced to create a market, create a need or a desire for his product. This, together with the Calvinistic canonization of wealth, brought about what we now call the "profit motive," namely, industrialism not so much for the production of real assets, but the production of real assets for the sake of money.

St. Thomas in the *Summa* (II-II, p. 77, a. 1) warns against the use of money for the sake of money. Money is not itself productive. Money is not a real asset. It only represents real assets. Hence, it is an expression of credit, which credit is a representative of real values. However, with mass production, the concept of credit changes. It now represents potential capital rather than actual capital, or rather, credit itself—the stocks of a corporation—is sold to stockholders and exchanged on the stock market not so much because of the actual production of a manufacturing concern, but more because of the average estimate of potential production. For all practical purposes, it results in a spiralling cycle of production for the sake of the stock holders, and buying and exchanging of stock to spur production for further bargaining in stock. In order that this speculation have a foundation in actual buying and selling of commodities and not be merely a speculative bubble, it is necessary to create a market, to educate people to buy over and above their needs and legitimate comforts. It has changed the concept of practical culture from domesticity to technocracy. It has had the good effect of providing people both with a ready access to real assets and with legitimate and much-needed labor saving devices. It has reduced drudgery almost to a minimum. But it has also minimized the real value of real assets and elevated the desire for gadgets. Hence, today, civilization has almost become synonomous with the "American way of life," which seems to be the latest thing off the assembly line.

Such a speculative bubble periodically bursts when actual production cannot equal expected production, and then we have depressions. The road to recovery, when wealth once again becomes common, is often inflation. But whereas a depression is a common loss consequent to the lesser value of stock, inflation is a lessening

of the purchasing power of money itself. Inflation may proceed from several causes. The apparent cause of inflation today is the stagnation of commodities and the prevalence of ready cash so that people are willing to pay exorbitant prices for commodities. The most common, and most effective cause is that of low-interest loans. Loans are given by banks to stimulate the circulation of money by extending a means of purchase. The more money given, the more money needed for coverage, and the more money printed. This reduces the value of paper money in ratio to the actual gold possession of a nation, and since money does not have the same ratio-to-gold-to-real assets, and since real assets retain their intrinsic worth, the expression of this is cheapness of money in higher prices.

The evil therefrom is multifold. First, it is an expression of a bad economy. The reference of means to end is reversed. Whereas money should be a means to the attaining of real assets, now the purchase of real assets is a means to a greater circulation in order that the manufacturers, bankers, business men may increase their monetary (not their real) wealth.

Secondly, this has a disastrous effect upon the middle class purchaser and the small business man. It is one of the most efficacious methods of eliminating the middle class, the "saving class." It does so by reducing the ratio between the purchasing power of paper money and real assets, thus making prices of commonly necessary commodities almost prohibitive. From this springs a host of evils. The middle class either has no opportunity to save or else has to cut into its saving bonds, annuities, bank accounts. It has to cut down upon insurance payments and policies, which, since they are expressed in the value of paper money, become almost worthless.

Thirdly, in the hands of a demagogue, inflation can be more devastating than a conquering army. When people lose their savings, they are fit to turn to any glittering scheme of governmental social security which more often than not is more glittering than secure. It is significant to note that one of the most penetrating criticisms of the abuses of capitalism, either at the hands of government or through the means of private capital, is advanced by Karl Marx in the *Communist Manifesto* and in *Capital*. These works have set a pattern not only for revolutions but also for conquests,

namely, to seize the real wealth of a country and then to flood it with worthless money. This was the technique of the Nazis, the Japanese, and is a great—and unfortunately unrated—part of the technique of the Soviet Union today.

Even without the complicated picture of international relations, possible war and strife, inflation is a severe evil within any country. Insofar as it makes the acquisition of real assets almost prohibitive, it is a source of economic discontent. We have seen it manifest in this country to such an extent that it has become primarily a political issue. That should be almost a last resource, and not the ready escape from personal obligations that it has become. We have seen the successive waves of price raising, wage demands, and strikes become so common and so widespread, so potentially—and often actually—harmful to the common good that a situation that should be settled by employer and employee, buyer and seller, all realizing and balancing their personal and mutual rights and duties, has been passed to federal arbitrators to such an extent that what was once almost a last court of appeals tends to become, more and more, the omni-competent State so destructive of personal rights.

In the personal lives of members of society, apart from the national and international consequences, inflation such as we have it, based upon a post-war shortage of commodities and a surplus of personal cheap money, has hastened a change of values. It has intensified the quest for superficially satisfactory gadgets. Things which were almost impossible to attain, by the fact that they are now attainable, although with difficulty, become so attractive that people are willing to make many a monetary sacrifice to purchase such articles.

Planned inflation, usually managed by low-interest loans, contributes to the confusing picture. On an international scale, as a means to the increasing of wealth through trade, it is a principle of economic and moral harm. Our first modern venture into planned inflation occurred in 1934 when we went off the gold standard to stimulate the circulation of foreign currency. The idea was that in debasing the dollar we automatically raised the purchasing power of the British pound and the French franc. This was to give the British and French the means whereby they might buy American products. This would, in turn, increase production

in the United States, increase work, and thus contribute to the ending of the depression.

It did not work, for it was founded upon a poor principle, namely, that money is an end in itself. Trade demands the exchange of real values, not the exchange of real assets for money, which is really credit. England and France had little to give us save money, and since their money was cheap, their credit was little. Had these countries been able to pay off in gold, then there might have been a point to the proceedings, but then, as now, these countries had little gold to sell; and had they sold what little they had, the consequent lowering of their international credit would have resulted in an even lower depth of the world depression.

The scheme is considered today. The intentions perhaps are good. It amounts to giving foreign nations illusive credit, so that in buying American machinery they may use it to start themselves on the road to recovery. However, there are two defects in the plan. The first is that it wreaks havoc with home economy. Any further debasing of the dollar will automatically raise prices again. The second is that the debtor nations do not have nor will they have a sufficiency of real assets soon to make such a contribution to the international common good. We must, of course, help toward world recovery. Yet it would better be done by stimulating the industries within the nations we plan to help that they may better maintain their own balance between their own production and their own real assets, thus supplying a more firm foundation to future international trade. The situation would better be helped even by free gifts covered by more equitable taxation, for taxation is a contribution to the future. Inflation, illusory as it is, builds up a huge national debt. Taxation is a cutting down in that national debt. Furthermore, taxation can be so graded as to exact a proportional amount from the various money classes able to pay. Inflation hits, wipes out, the middle class, and goes under the euphonism of "capital levy"—except that it levies the wrong capital. Fundamentally, taxation is a contribution to the balance between money and real assets, and, as such, tends to lower prices, whereas inflation only prolongs an evil that is, for all practical consequences, as expensive as taxation and far more destructive of national and international wealth.

Since, then, inflation is fraught with evils striking at the common good, we may summarize it as follows:

(1) It aims a direct blow at the one valid reason for a capitalistic and industrial economy, namely, real assets. That being the case, it has a definite immorality about it.

(2) It is the last measure of an immoral point of view as regards capital, namely, profit for the sake of profit. It is, moreover, the reversal of the proper ordination of means to an end, and such a deordination, the elevation of a means to an end, is immoral.

(3) It is destructive of personal wealth, insofar as it reduces the purchasing value of money in relation to real assets. In such way, it harms the saving classes, who are the steadying influence in capitalistic economy.

(4) It is a cause of social unrest within society, insofar as it contributes to the natural discontent of those who see their savings floating away in the hands of demagogic speculation. This leaves a dangerous potential, namely, a discontented people, often ready to listen to glittering promises from a social demagogue.

(5) It is a dangerous weapon in international relations and, as such, can wreck not only national economy, but also the possibility of international economic co-operation.

Inflation is definitely an evil. The question arises, then, as to what might be done to curb it. For an immediate suggestion, since the present inflation is largely because of the shortage of commodities and the superfluity of money, we might, in our relations with people, suggest the element of sacrifice to this extent, that they limit their buying mostly to necessities. It is only when the present whirlwind circulation of cheap money slows down to a more normal and more reasonable circulation of sound money that prices will go down.

However, in the long run, and as a more permanent measure, we must face the profit motive. As long as we have an unbridled profit motive as the efficient principle in our capitalistic system, there will always be the danger of depression and inflation. We must strike as a more stable norm for the ratio between prices and goods than that of the mere whim of a board of directors. And here we meet a difficulty, a fundamental difficulty in any investigation of any aspect of economy, namely, that there are no absolute created values. In the field of economics, there are no absolute prices. Even in the simplest economy, there is, for exam-

ple, no reason, save that of mutual agreement of mutual needs, why a day's work should be evaluated at two bushels of wheat or the equivalent coin of the realm to purchase two bushels of wheat. The moral theologians use the expression "aestimatio moralis" in almost every definition of a just price, and leave it mostly to prudence in application. But it is relative, and, hence, changing with different conditions. This demands investigation.

A fair price is one which covers the cost of production and transportation—for example, in the case of the farmer, one which covers the money he puts into the raising of a given crop and bringing it to market—plus a fair profit. Obviously, a large concern must cover the buying of large amounts of raw materials and a large payroll. This starts the cycle all over again, namely, that in order to make a profit and yet to keep prices within the buying range of the consumer, the manufacturer must produce huge lots of his product. That means that he must expand, seek new markets, develop his product, add more workers to the payroll, produce more to meet the larger payroll, expand again, etc. This, in turn, usually ends, sooner or later, in a depression, when credit capital gets beyond the expected ability to produce. And we must remember that a depression is a temptation to manipulate the value of currency in order to start the circulation of paper money again.

In facing this problem, as complex as it is, we have to aim directly at the core and essence of the system. We have to think in terms of real assets. In doing so, we might as well face the fact that we are not able to do away with industrialism. Nor do we wish to do so. Industrialism has brought us too many values for it to be scuttled. We do not wish to go back economically to the Middle Ages. Nor do we wish to go back to a primitive economy, save where we can adapt the desirable features of a simplified economy to present and future needs.

A movement which we should support is a back-to-the-land tendency. This brings man in close proximity to the soil, the ultimate source of his material well-being, and to the family, which, in the Christian dispensation, has been raised to a sacramental means to his spiritual well-being. We are aware of the dangerous abuses of urbanization, among them an almost total dependence upon capitalism for income as well as the atomization of the family. Rural life today combines the better features of industrialism with

the simplification to domestically ordered living. Furthermore, rural development means the actual and free opening up of our natural resources, our real assets, and thus contributes to national well-being.

A second means worth investigation and trial is the co-operative movement. Since this is done on a comparatively small scale, it means a better evaluation of goods according to their intrinsic worth, and not according to a precontrolled market price. It is an economy closer to real assets, and we have seen that real assets are the essence of any economic system. We may note that some of the co-operative schemes which have been tried have failed. The fault may be partly our own for allowing shallow economic theorists to handle the situation and for not lending the encouragement that we, as those trained in moral questions, should lend. Concerning our duty to be concerned with economic questions in their moral aspects, we have the command of Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI. How well we can enter into the question depends upon circumstances. However, we should ever be prepared to do so and to lend encouragement.

A third means is to encourage people to buy from the small business man. If there is a sufficient encouragement of small business—outside of the obvious advantage of neighborliness, which, after all, can be an expression of Christian charity—by force of the law of supply and demand, the larger companies will have to stabilize their prices according to the needs of the people, rather than forcing the consumer to shape his needs according to the arbitrary demands of credit fluctuations. For example, a vexing problem today is the prices set for farmers. If farmers could sell their produce locally they would not be so forced to submit to the demands of nation-wide concerns. For the small business man, local trade is a preventative to the ruthlessly unjust closing out of the small operator which has so characterized the growth and history of American capitalism.

Should the objection be offered that local patronage and co-operative movements would contribute to unemployment, we can counter that local patronage would have a tendency to contribute to local employment, and might even—who knows?—contribute to restoring the laborer to his dignity of a craftsman rather than his present state of being a drudge. Furthermore, should there be un-

employment, there is always the need for development of natural resources. We can and should support any sound governmental policy which will develop our natural resources, such as soil conservation and reclamation, control of waterways, preservation of timberlands. Such will not come from private interests, which are more concerned with the use and consumption of these resources than with their reasonable and necessary preservation. Any governmental scheme which would carry on such a program demands our co-operation insofar as it is a duty to society and a means of handling unemployment. Such a plan does not mean working for the State. It means working for the well-being of society through the instrument of society, which is the State. As citizens we owe it to ourselves and our fellow citizens to prevent abuses which might arise. Such abuses are not fundamentally the fault of the State. They are the fault of the members of the State who do not take sufficient interest in the operations of their government and who do not check up on their government by their strongest instrument, the vote.

The whole problem of inflation and price determination is an exposé of the weaknesses of huge credit capitalism. It is a moral question that demands settlement. Such settlement will not come from capital. It should not have to come directly from government. It must come from the people. As a moral question it demands our investigation. It further demands our directive influence lest it get entirely beyond our control in the hands of a potentially omnicompetent State. Fundamentally, however, it demands our direction because of man's end. Man lives for God in the supernatural order. He should have the economic freedom to devote his life to the pursuit of God, and he should not be forced to spend his time and energy hurrying down distracting bypaths to have the very beginnings of security. In bringing about the proper order, we shall undoubtedly have to fight selfishness. We may have to bring about a conversion of a too-common point of view. But, conversion was Christ's last command to us, and this is one means of observing that command.

LEO A. FOLEY, S.M.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

SAN DIEGO CAMPAIGNS FOR SOULS

The recent campaign for converts launched simultaneously in every parish in the diocese of San Diego has attracted nation-wide interest and has brought us inquiries from archbishops, bishops, priests and editors for details of the plan. Accordingly, we shall sketch briefly some of the methods and means which Bishop Buddy pressed into service in his spiritual crusade.

It offers a general pattern which may be followed in part or in whole in every diocese and in every parish in America. It is rich in suggestiveness and every priest interested in convert work will find in its carefully worked out plan many pointers which will enhance the effectiveness of his own efforts to win souls.

It will go down in the history of the Church of America as the first systematic effort of a diocese to mobilize all its resources—its priests, Sisters, Brothers, schools, hospitals and especially its entire laity—to bring the full deposit of divine truth to all the churchless people living in its territory. This is what makes the campaign unique, distinctive and of national interest and importance.

It is to be noted that the campaign is not a "flash in the pan," a capricious spurt of short duration. It is to continue through the entire year. Next fall it will be renewed with still greater intensity and effectiveness resulting from the experience accumulated during the year. There is to be no surcease until every churchless family has been won for Christ and every strayed sheep has been returned to the Master's fold.

IMPORTANT FEATURES

What are some of the features which proved especially effective and which would seem to promise help in other campaigns in parishes and in dioceses? We summarize them briefly:

(1) The intensive six weeks' campaign of prayer preceding the campaign brought God's blessing upon the work and awakened the laity to a twofold realization: they have a precious treasure in their holy Catholic Faith and they should share it with others. It went a long way toward making them convert-minded: without

this spirit and enthusiasm the campaign would have speedily bogged down.

(2) The holding for all the clergy of a Day of Recollection during which all the meditations were upon the convert work heightened the priest's consciousness of the role which he is privileged to play in winning souls for the divine Master. The priest recalls the hunger in the heart of Christ which prompted Him to spend Himself in the ceaseless and unwearying quest for souls. Like his divine model, he too goes from his day of prayer, meditation and silence filled with a driving hunger for souls.

(3) Conferences were conducted for all the Sisters, school, hospital and missionary ones. They were made an integral part of the campaign organization. Their prayers, their words to pupils and patients contributed much to the success of the campaign. Especially helpful were Our Lady of Victory Missionary Sisters (sponsored largely by Bishop Noll) whose chief work is searching for the sheep strayed from the Master's fold. Their labors among the Indians and Mexicans have reclaimed thousands and their zeal in calling at homes of churchless families is an inspiration for priests and people. They are dedicated to the "shoe-leather" Apostolate, the one most desperately needed by the Church today. May they grow by leaps and bounds!

(4) The Legion of Mary rendered invaluable service by providing leadership in recruiting prospects for instruction. They are experienced in calling upon "newcomers" in a parish, in visiting the sick and in searching for indifferent and fallen-away Catholics. From work of this nature to calling at the homes of churchless people is a step easy to take. It is difficult to understand how any parish interested in winning converts can operate effectively without a couple of chapters of the Legion.

(5) The use of converts in recruiting is most profitable. Knowing the prejudices and the common misconceptions of non-Catholics, converts are peculiarly fitted to recruit people for the Inquiry Class. In every parish we found they were outstanding. It is advisable to form a permanent organization of the converts in each parish and to encourage them to show their appreciation of the treasure of their holy Catholic Faith by sharing it each year with at least one other person.

(6) The enlistment of large numbers of the laity was probably the most distinctive feature of this campaign. Properly trained, they make excellent recruiters. They all know some non-Catholics and they have contacts which no priest has. When they can be enlisted in large numbers in the recruiting of instructees, the Information Forum will never lack a sizeable audience. The good will and latent missionary zeal of our thirty million constitute a spiritual Niagara whose tremendous energies can be harnessed to the winning not of thousands but of millions of churchless people for Christ.

(7) The pastor's practice of standing at the church's front door and greeting the people as they enter and leave enables him to meet many non-Catholic visitors. It is easy to invite such persons to the Information Forum and to place a suitable pamphlet or book in their hands. We noticed Fr. Michael O'Connor at Palm Springs and other priests putting the Front Door Apostolate to excellent service. It should be used at every Sunday Mass in every church by all the priests—pastor and curates alike.

At St. Patrick's Church in Miami Beach, Msgr. William Barry has given a magnificent demonstration of the fruitfulness of the Front Door Apostolate. For forty years he has made it his practice to greet the people, as they enter and as they leave, at all the Masses. It has enabled him to win a great number of converts and to build one of the most complete and impressive Church plants in the Southland. We, too, can vouch for the fruitfulness of the Front Door Apostolate in contacting many non-Catholics and in interesting appreciable numbers of them to study the Faith behind the ceremonies which they just witnessed.

(8) Information Forums or Inquiry Classes were conducted in every parish. People will attend such public lectures when they will not come for private instruction, for they have not made up their minds as yet and hence do not want to take so much of a priest's time when they might not enter the Church.

(9) Care was exercised in choosing the name for the crusade. As the word "convert" is subject to misinterpretation and often rubs sensitive feelings of church-affiliated persons adversely, it is not entirely suitable for use in general publicity—especially in public newspapers. Hence the crusade was generally called a Campaign for Souls.

(10) Publicity was secured in the daily newspapers and the diocesan weekly as well as at all the Masses in every parish church, Sunday after Sunday. Thousands of letters were sent out to churchless people, inviting them to the Information Forum as well as of assuring them a hearty welcome at all the services of the Church. Few if any people living in the San Diego diocese could have escaped an invitation, oral or written, to the public lectures explaining the Catholic religion.

(11) Pamphlets were distributed but not on a sufficiently large scale. When funds are available, a pamphlet should be left at every home called upon. Many who won't come to public lectures are willing to read literature in the privacy of their home. In many cases a pamphlet will be the entering wedge; it will arouse interest which can be satisfied only by a complete course of instruction.

(12) Books of instruction were loaned and circulated in limited numbers. Among those most widely circulated were: *Father Smith Instructs Jackson, The Faith of Millions, What's the Truth about Catholics?, The Faith of Our Fathers, Truths Men Live By, The Road to Damascus* and *Where I Found Christ.* Many who came for instruction testified that they became interested through reading one or another of these books.

These are some of the means widely used in the campaign for souls in the San Diego diocese. They have been helpful in recruiting unusually large numbers of non-Catholics for instruction.

SOME EARLY RESULTS

We have just received from Bishop Buddy a report on the results of the first four months of the campaign for converts in the San Diego diocese. Though the campaign is not yet completed, the results achieved already are most gratifying.

Participating in the campaign are 111 parishes, ministered to by 251 priests. Lay campaigners canvassed 4,694 square blocks and 1,121 rural districts. They called at 95,054 non-Catholic homes, inviting the residents to the Information Forums established in all the parishes to explain in a friendly manner the credentials and teachings of the Catholic religion.

Despite the fact that the volunteer canvassers were for the most

part untrained in the technique of such work, 95 per cent of the people welcomed the callers and gave them a courteous hearing. Indeed, 6,118 of them expressed interest in learning more about the Catholic religion either through literature or lectures. Of these, 1,946 are actually attending instruction classes. Please pray that all may receive the grace of faith.

The block captains report that at about only 5 per cent of the 95,054 non-Catholic homes visited did they encounter any unfriendliness or resentment.

"Most of the people," remarked a canvasser, "seemed pleasantly surprised to discover that we Catholics were at all interested in their religious status and were eager to explain to them the teachings of our holy Faith."

"This is indeed a surprise," remarked one non-Catholic lady, "to receive an invitation to services at a Catholic church. I have lived here thirty years and this is the first time I ever had a Catholic speak to me about her religion or offer to escort me to lectures explaining it. I know so little about it that a little more light on it wouldn't do me any harm."

Her reaction was typical of that of many others. But the indifference to religion which now characterizes such large sections of American life was the more frequent attitude encountered. Others professed to have some other church affiliation, though many of them acknowledged that they rarely attended the services.

While the total of nearly two thousand now taking instructions is most encouraging, there is another result that is even more gratifying. That is the return of 4,784 lapsed Catholics to the practice of their Faith. The canvass disclosed that the number of fallenaways is disturbingly large and that systematic efforts must be made on a large scale to reclaim them before the embers of their Faith flicker out in the darkness of unbelief.

The failure to practice their Faith tends to blunt the sensitivity of their spiritual nature, to dull their conscience and to extinguish the light of faith in their souls. Indifference is the midway point on the road to complete loss of faith. No one can neglect the practice of his religion for any considerable time without grave peril to his salvation.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Parishes with resident pastors	119
Parishes actively participating in campaign for converts	111
Priests in diocese	274
Priests engaged in campaign	251
Square blocks canvassed	4,694
Rural districts canvassed	1,121
Non-Catholic homes visited	95,054
Non-Catholics who expressed interest in taking instructions	6,118
Non-Catholics actually taking instructions	1,946
Lapsed Catholics who returned to the faith (approximate)	4,784
Information forums organized through the diocese (in addition to private instructions)	149*

* This figure includes classes organized in hospitals, military installations and other institutions. Some parishes run two forums.

CONCLUSION

The reclamation of the astonishing total of nearly five thousand fallen-aways indicates that to achieve the maximum fruit a systematic campaign for converts must include the search for lapsed Catholics. Otherwise it loses at least half of its fruitfulness. In many cases the fallen-aways were never properly instructed and so they can appropriately be included in the instruction classes.

The San Diego campaign gives a striking demonstration of the effectiveness of lay workers in recruiting prospects. Think of the hours spent by hundreds of workers in calling upon 95,054 non-Catholic homes and making a report of each visit on a separate card. Think, too, of the fruitfulness of such house-to-house canvassing: 1,946 non-Catholics enrolled in courses of systematic instruction and 4,784 fallen-aways reclaimed! They made it necessary to establish 149 Information Forums to instruct all the prospects recruited.

The results underline the truth of Archbishop Cushing's statement in the symposium, *Sharing the Faith,* recently published by *Our Sunday Visitor* press: "Our laity are ideally situated to recruit prospects for instruction. The convert movement will make notable progress only when every Catholic throws himself with

zeal and determination into the task of winning each year at least one soul for Christ."

The bishop, priests and faithful of the San Diego diocese have shown the Catholics of America what can be accomplished when all roll up their sleeves and really go to work. They have blazed a new trail in the convert apostolate and set an inspiring example which will be followed throughout the length and breadth of our land.

No wonder it is that the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate has sent them his hearty congratulations upon the unprecedented fruitfulness of their crusade for souls. Supremely gratifying, too, is the cablegram from Cardinal Pizzardo, telling of the joy of the Holy Father upon learning of the magnificent results and conveying the Apostolic Blessing upon all who participated in the campaign. Only God, however, can reward them adequately for their months of tireless zeal and unflagging devotion in staging the most fruitful campaign for souls ever conducted in America.

JOHN A. O'BRIEN

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Ind.

MAJOR ISSUE OF PARISH SOCIOLOGY

One of the most important results emerging from pioneering research in any scientific field is the stimulation of thought and discussion. Other scientists study your work, compare it to their own experiences, analyze the generalizations and conclusions, and make fruitful and penetrating comments. This process is of great value in the search for truth, because challenging questions are raised, new problems are recognized, paradigms for further research are devised, and knowledge is expanded.

Pioneer research in the sociology of the urban parish is this kind of field. Our own modest research project in "Southern Parish," part of which was published in the book, *Dynamics of a City Church,* seems to have provoked a sort of minor controversy. In the great variety of reviews of this book numerous picayune criticisms were raised which need not detain us here.[1] But some of the reviews have also raised several major issues which are basically important and around which there has developed serious and intelligent discussion. These constitute some of the problem areas of parochial sociology which stimulate deeper thought and further research.

I have selected a half dozen of these representative issues for discussion, but not with the intention of "settling" any of them. On the contrary, they are presented here because of their significance and their provocativeness, and especially because they seem to admit of no easy answers. They represent the partial comment of four non-Catholic social scientists, Professors LaViolette, Lynd, Wach and Eister; of two priests, Father Reinhold, a pastor, and Father Schuyler, a sociologist; and of a Catholic social-actionist, Miss Bartelme.

The order in which they are given here is not meant to indicate an order of importance. These major problem areas are as follows: (1) the impact of urban change on the religious behavior of Catholic parishioners; (2) the Church as a power structure in relation to the larger society; (3) social integration as a consequent of free religious choice; (4) the social implications of the sacraments and

[1] See, for example, the editorial in *The Priest* for November, 1951, and my article in reply in January, 1952.

the liturgy; (5) the motivation of religious behavior; (6) the need for structural reform of the urban parish.

(1) The *impact of urban change* on the religious behavior of Catholic parishioners is a social problem which requires much more study and analysis. In his review of *Southern Parish,* Professor LaViolette questions the "assumption that in earlier days a closer conformance to the ideals of the church existed."[2] In a traditional social system like the Church, the older parishioners frequently allude to their younger days when everybody was "more religious." They imply that together with all the other changes they have experienced in city life there has been a change for the worse in religion and morality. They give the impression that the modern generation is disregarding the precepts and practices of the elders.

The problem here is twofold: in what ways do the patterns of religious behavior now differ from those of our forefathers; and secondly, what urban factors have been at work to bring about these differences? Satisfactory answers to both of these questions require a great deal of cautious research and a certain amount of difficult judgment. What scientific criteria can be used in deciding what is better and what is worse in the generalized customs of a city church?

There has unquestionably been a falling off in church attendance at traditional evening services, sermons, vespers, rosary, Benediction, and so forth. Mixed marriages are increasing. Relations between priests and parishioners are becoming less primary and more formalized. There has also been a decrease of interest and activity in the formal parochial organizations, as well as in those gatherings like church suppers, parish festivals and dances, which used to bring together socially large numbers of parishioners of every age.

On the other hand, there has been an increase in the frequency of the reception of Holy Communion and of the Sacrament of Penance by both sexes and at all age levels. Adult male attendance at Mass has increased. Nocturnal Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament has attracted large numbers of men. The First Friday in honor of the Sacred Heart, and the First Saturday in honor of Our

[2] Forrest E. LaViolette, Tulane University, *American Sociological Review,* XVII, 2 (1952), 254 f.

Lady of Fatima have brought larger number to our city churches. The week-end retreat movement for both men and women is growing everywhere in our cities. The Block Rosary has shown a remarkable vitality. Other new and popular expressions of religion are found in Cana Conferences, the liturgical movement, Catholic Action, inter-racial councils, and similar socio-religious activities.

The factors of urban change are numerous and serious, and everyone recognizes them. Housing is overcrowded, recreation is largely passive and commercialized, education and the professions are becoming more specialized, leisure time is increasing, the material standard of living continues to rise, the means of communication and transportation are more available.

We talk a great deal about secularism today, and we say that the cities are the centers of secularism. Have all of these changes had a secularizing effect upon the Catholic urban parishioner? Have they made it more difficult for a person to be a forthright, integrated Christian? It is to be expected that in our dynamic society the modern executive is not like the industrialist of fifty years ago; and it is to be expected also that the modern Catholic parishioner does not fit the mold of a half-century ago. While it would be presumptuous to say that the Church has successfully met the challenge of American urbanization, it seems reasonable to make the tentative hypothesis that urban Catholic spirituality, while different, is not of a lower grade than its predecessor. At least, this hypothesis is worthy of serious consideration and scientific testing.

The factors of urban change, the process of change itself, and its results, must be studied *specifically* in relation to their significance to Catholics in parish life. A comparative research model would not be too difficult to construct. A simultaneous study could be carried on in two contemporary parishes, the one in a city which is presumed to be relatively dynamic, and the other in a village which is presumed to be relatively static. Perhaps in a city parish where dependable records have been maintained, the most recent ten-year period could be compared with the last decade of the last century.[3]

Testing the hypothesis that urban Catholicism is different, but not worse, than it used to be, is complicated by the need to judge

[3] Redfield's Yucatan study of four communities on a continuum is an example of the first, and Hughes' *French Canada in Transition* an example of the latter.

between different modes of religious expression. The greatest difficulty would lie in the selection of scientific criteria by which to judge what is better and what is worse. Running through the comparison, of course, are certain central and expected religious observances like attendance at Sunday Mass, making the Easter duties, infant baptism and validity of marriages. These are reliable patterns of behavior which can be aptly compared through the use of rates and percentages.

(2) The Church is a *power structure* in the larger society. Professor Lynd touches upon an explosively controversial concept in his review of *Southern Parish*.[4] He is interested in the sociology of the Catholic parish because he regards the Catholic Church "as the best-organized international power structure operating across the world today." He thinks of the Church in technical terms as a "social apparatus," advancing rapidly, using planned programs, having a stout, but flexible, policy which aims at enhancing welfare programs consonant with its doctrines in the general society.

This raises the general but significant issue of the impact of Catholicism on the modern world. If it is put in terms of the struggle between the value systems of Communism and Catholicism, or of the constant competitive effort between Protestantism and Catholicism for the eternal salvation of men's souls, it is not likely to cause controversy or protest. The American, and above all the "objective" social scientist who is American-trained, prides himself on a kind of cool aloofness from ideological struggles which are based on religion. But this is not the precise point of issue here.

A man like Lynd tends to ask the question: values for what? or *Knowledge for What?* (the title of one of his best-known books). In other words, to what extent and in what manner will this well-organized social apparatus, called the Roman Catholic Church, affect social functions, relations and structures? The Church is committed to the monumental task of restoring society with all its forms and institutions to Christ. This means that the Church aims at exerting a tremendous moral, cultural and social influence over all aspects of human society. In this sense, the Church is an internal power structure which will necessarily have an external social effect.

[4] Robert S. Lynd, Columbia University, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 279 (1952), 228 f.

On the modest plane of social research of the parish—the grass-roots level of Catholicism—this question of the Church's influence on the local community cannot escape the attention of the social scientist. The universal missionary function is at work there: the intention to convert and to embrace all within reach. On a higher plane, in national affairs, this inherently expansive function of the Church has been interpreted by men like Blanshard as a "lust for power."

There can be no doubt that to a fearful and misinformed outsider, the sacred authority of the hierarchy and the loyal devotion of the laity look like the makings of a different sort of "power structure." The misapprehension of some non-Catholics in this regard seems to stem from two general errors. The first is the belief that the monarchical and hierarchical administrative structure of the Church is totally inconsistent with the American democratic way of life.[5] The second is that they fail to realize that (except for the religious institution) American Catholics have been culturally trained in the same traditions, and participate side by side with non-Catholics in the same social structures and forms and institutions.

These two errors, as well as the political misapprehensions of non-Catholics, can be corrected and allayed through the systematic study and reporting of the Church as a social system in the American cities. It is a truism to say that people fear what they do not know. Catholicism, as a social and cultural system, is an unexplored area to millions of American Protestants. It is a jungle of myths even to the sociologists of religion who, as Lynd says, have found it a "hard-to-penetrate area." Fears and suspicions and antagonisms are almost always associated with ignorance. We must not be surprised when non-Catholics think that the Church's power structure has a Fascist flavor (which is as abhorrent to American Catholics as it is to them).

On the other hand, the true influence of the Church is a moral and spiritual ascendancy which must ultimately affect the whole society's patterns of thought and behavior. It is said to be like the yeast in the loaf which liberates and elevates and expands. In spite

[5] This is part of the problem which bothers Professor Eister, whose comments are discussed below in the third major issue.

of the mores and the resistance to change found in even the most dynamic society, we are always dealing with human beings who have the power of choice. In general terms, that choice is still between God and Mammon. The Church places its values before the conscience of men, through which its influence must penetrate to all social institutions, promote the highest social values, clarify and strengthen the beliefs of men.

If it is true that human beings tend toward consistency in both their internal patterns and their external behavior, the influence of the Church over their hearts and minds must be an influence also over their conduct. The social scientist distinguishes between sacred and secular behavior, and he is able to study cultural trends to determine which is predominant. The Church, as the authoritative voice of God on earth, is unquestionably a moral power, and in so far as it succeeds in replacing secularism with supernaturalism in society, it will be a proper and effective "power structure."

(3) *Social integration as a consequent of free religious choice.* The question involved in these two terms is what Allan Eister has called a "head-on collision." In his review of *Southern Parish*[6] he challenges the assumption I made to the effect that the Roman Catholic Church is the likeliest agency for the social reintegration of western society.[7] This statement is said to be in disagreement with the "liberal democratic view" that the best guarantee of social unity is the principle of individual freedom to choose one's way to God and salvation.

Perhaps no one knows better than a social scientist that there is a fundamental divergence between these two approaches to social integration. The liberal Protestant view does not necessarily and always hold that everyone's religion is objectively true (or that one religion is as good as another) but it does hold the principle that everyone should be free to choose his own way to God. As a matter of fact the Catholic Church officially endorses the principle that people must be allowed freely to choose the truth and follow it.[8] But the Church always and necessarily teaches that objective

[6] Allan W. Eister, Southern Methodist University, *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, XXXII, 4 (1952), 281-83.

[7] See *Dynamics of a City Church*, p. 4.

[8] Can. 1351: "No one is to be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will." See the important contribution to this question by George W. Shea, "Spain and Religious Freedom," *AER*, CXXVII, 3 (1952), 161-72.

religious truth is one, that she is the divinely appointed guardian of that truth on earth, and that all other denominations and sects are in some degree in error.

But the thesis here under consideration deals with the matter of social integration. Is social unity better achieved on a basis of consensus on doctrinal values and practices (such as the Catholic Church strives for), or on a basis of "agreeing to disagree" (such as Mr. Eister seems to encourage)? Anthropological studies of various societies and communities throughout the world tend to conclude that integrated social relations usually occur when there is major consensus on the highest beliefs and valuations. Within the ethos, or the "ideal core" of the culture, religious and moral beliefs are objectively scaled at the top of any hierarchy of values.

It is conceded that the researcher in social science will undoubtedly have his own "sectarian bias" which is indicated by his selection of a particular area of research in the sociology of religion. He goes scientifically astray, however, not by stating his "bias" but by trying to conceal it, or by forcing his discovered social facts to coincide with his bias. This I have not done. Despite the fact that I tentatively maintain the hypothesis of social solidarity based on a consensus of values, I have found in my modest research in urban Catholic parishes that Catholics seem to be for the most part united more on secular ideologies than on common religious values.[9]

This is a serious problem because the research data on urban Catholicism seem to challenge an hypothesis which appears to be historically demonstrable and to which most social theorists cling. There are many avenues open to research in this field. Is the size (territorial and numerical) of the typical urban parish a factor? Does the small rural parish demonstrate the social integration which is wanting in the city congregation, and if so, what ecological factors are significant? Is there any influence from the ethnic composition of the parish population, their occupational roles, their social status, their local and regional mobility? Have the concrete

[9] For example, white Catholics are often closely integrated in concrete social relations with white Protestants, co-operating actively in various groups and organizations, but refusing to have any association with Negroes who are their fellow parishioners and members with them in the Mystical Body of Christ.

"secular" values replaced in social importance the "uninteresting" other-wordly, religious values taught by the Church?

The issue raised by Mr. Eister, and particularly his assumption that freedom of religious choice is a principle of social integration, requires scientific analysis and research. Logically, it does not appear to be tenable. Nor can it be accepted merely because large numbers of Americans hold it. We like to think in the United States that democracy and universal brotherhood can achieve a social unity and an integrated culture *which allows for fundamental differences of religious beliefs.* We have done a fairly good job of embracing antagonistic religious loyalties under a sort of quasi-nationalism.

This seems to have come about for two main reasons: first, in so far as we are relatively well united socially we have done it *in spite* of (not because of) our different religious beliefs; and secondly, we have perhaps subordinated, through a spirit of religious indifferentism, our religious values to patriotic and materialistic values. We Catholics, at least on a theoretical and doctrinal basis, offer a principle quite different from that of Mr. Eister: that wide religious consensus tends to diminish group antagonisms and thus increases national unity and social integration.

(4) *Social implication of sacraments and liturgy.* Fr. Joseph Schuyler says that the "tremendous potentiality" of the sacraments and the liturgy "for achieving social harmony in Catholic and civic life" is not mentioned in *Southern Parish.*[10] From one point of view, this is a more detailed defense of my own stand against Mr. Eister on religious consensus as a principle of social integration. It is an important concept and it is given some consideration in a paper on "parochial Solidarity" read by the author at the Annual Convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society in Chicago in 1949. I doubt, however, that it is treated in the manner which the reviewer seems to suggest.

In a sense this problem also overlaps the question of motivation of religious behavior mentioned below. The operation of divine grace through the sacraments provides a real social unity (in the higher ontological order) since baptism introduces us into a truly

[10] Joseph B. Schuyler, Woodstock College, *Woodstock Letters,* LXXXI, 1 (1952), 100 f.

social Body of Christ, and the Eucharist, the sacrament of love, unites us more closely to God and to our fellow men. The liturgy, through the actual social participation of the laity in religious services, provides a social situation for group prayer, thought and action.

These "social implications" of the sacraments and the liturgy have been discussed time and again in popular as well as learned Catholic periodicals. God's grace *does* unite us on a spiritual plane and it *should* motivate us to live more harmoniously in the day-to-day social relations in which we participate. This doctrine has been widely taught and preached as a compelling *motive* for the improvement of the actual social relations among Catholics.

But the social scientist works on a lower plane. He must grub among the profane and the measurable. He readily admits that the external social behavior which he observes, the words that he hears, may well be activated by sacramental grace and liturgical ideals, but he also regrets to admit that he cannot measure the functioning of divine grace in itself. He is brought up against some hard facts. When he studies a Catholic parish in which the rich and the poor have no social contact and less sympathy with each other, where whites and Negroes are separated by rigid caste lines, where the successful materialist enjoys higher social prestige than the tubercular saint who died of starvation—he asks himself where is the social and externally observable fulfillment of the sacramental and liturgical ideals?

The social scientist expects to see no miracles and he must always be careful to distinguish *what ought to be* from *what is*. But he also respectfully agrees that there is great wisdom in the dictum: "by their fruits you shall know them." Because there are social implications in religious doctrines, there is no guarantee that the implications will become explicit in the social conduct of parishioners.

The preacher, the theologian, the social philosopher, perform a socially valuable service when they explain and urge the necessity for implementation of socio-religious ideals. They demonstrate logically the intrinsic connection between the order of grace and the order of nature. They explain carefully that in the life of the integrated Christian human co-operation with divine grace must result in the striving for both personal and social perfection. But

the social scientist reports what he sees and hears. He analyzes these reports and tries to generalize on that which is relevant and significant *within the selected area of study.*

The question of immediate interest to the social scientist, therefore, is not the social implication of the sacraments and liturgy, but their social results. An area of fruitful research could be staked out here. Two categories of people could be studied and compared within the same community. The variable element would be the presence or absence of sacraments and liturgy. The constant element would be the actual social integration and social awareness exhibited by each group. In other words, the Catholics, who have the advantage of the sacraments and the Mass, could be compared with the non-Catholics who do not have these advantages.

Out of a controlled study of this kind there could be discovered in some rough way the extent to which the social implications of sacraments and liturgy are realized. It is one thing to preach an hypothesis, and it is quite another thing to prove it. A realistic awareness of the facts of social life is ultimately more valuable for the progress of the Church than the most masterful defense of a questionable hypothesis.

(5) *The motivation of religious behavior.* The analysis of motivation is one of the most difficult areas into which the social psychologist can venture. At the same time it is one of the most important since the social results of the false imputation of motives are frequently serious. Motivation is complex and multiple, and its relations to specific human actions is frequently obscure. In a long review of *Southern Parish,* Joachim Wach points this out when he says that "identical behavior might be motivated quite differently."[11]

In the hierarchy of motives for social behavior it is undoubtedly true that the "highest" is the love of God. As the social scientist observes the external patterns of religious behavior in a parish he must assume that the agents are motivated, at least to some degree, by divine love. But this assumption is not scientifically verifiable with any degree of accuracy simply because the main factor involved is immeasurable and imponderable. The procedure of canon-

[11] Joachim Wach, University of Chicago, *The Journal of Religion,* XXXII, 2, pp. 139-41.

ization, however, shows that the Church employs extraordinary criteria for discerning (after death) the sanctity of a person who has been steadily motivated by divine love.

The social scientist is constrained to study the social relations of living persons in contemporary groups. He knows in a general way that the motivational roots of human behavior are multiple and intertwined. His specific problem lies in trying to get at other than surface or assumed motives. People attend Mass, receive the sacraments, participate in parochial activities, for many and mixed reasons. They may have built up a habit pattern more out of imitation than out of conviction. The desire for social prestige may help or hinder their religious behavior, depending upon the cultural pressures of the community. Furthermore, their motives may vary from one time to another, from one situation to another, and run the gamut from divine love to conventional habit.

The present tools of social psychology are admittedly inadequate for the measurement of motives, but the scientific attempt must be continued. Some of the techniques devised are ingenious: depth psychology or psychoanalysis, Rohrshach tests, apperception tests, thematic approaches and so forth. Most of these are financially prohibitive in the study of a large social unit like the urban Catholic parish.

There remains the technique of the straight interview in which the individual parishioner explains his own behavior. Here the snare of rationalization, innocent though it may be, tends to trap the researcher. Every experienced social scientist realizes that some "downward revision" is necessary when a large group of people is questioned about attitudes, beliefs, what they "would do," why they have acted in a certain way. This is why my chapter on the "Catholic Mind of the Parish"[12] was hedged around with numerous cautions, and why the statistical results as published make the interviewees appear even "more Catholic" than they actually are.

Despite these difficulties, the findings of motivational analysis, in so far as they are reliable, would be extremely helpful to the Church and to the parish. If in any given situation there were even a general knowledge of the motivational factors of religious behavior, the clergy and laity could co-operate to manipulate those

[12] See *Dynamics of a City Church*, pp. 259-61.

factors for favorable and desired results. Induced changes in institutional patterns and in social structures could promote the positive factors and discourage the negative.

The insistent instruction and preaching of the Church constantly emphasize the highest motives for human conduct. This cannot be otherwise, for the Church by its nature must function in an inspirational way, and—it may be added—the Church is no amateur in the techniques of propaganda. But while this particular spiritual impact on the individual conscience must not be diminished, it may find a modest ally in more prosaic motives for the maintenance of a social conscience.

In other words, there is a need to understand the extent and manner in which non-spiritual motives affect religious behavior. It is not simply a study of the actual social conditions existing in any parish, but of the means-end relationship in which the social conditions become motives (or are rationalized as motives) for religious behavior. This knowledge could contribute much to the Church's attempt to raise the behavioral ideals of its members on the parish level. The problem in the realm of practical application is not only to raise the standards of motivation and to purify them; it is also to know the natural motives for social behavior in order to manipulate them.

(6) The *need for structural reform* is mentioned in some way or another by several reviewers of *Southern Parish*. Father Reinhold suggests the need for a "complete rebirth from the source" and takes a dim view of twentieth-century urban Catholicism. Miss Bartelme talks about reforming the parish in a shape that would promote maximum spiritual participation by its members.[13] These suggestions dig deeply into the whole problem of the present social structure of American urban parishes. The reviewers, in this regard, seem to have been influenced by the so-called "radical" innovations occurring in some European parishes.

This is another major issue which confronts the Church in our dynamic urban culture. Although it deals with a matter that rests ultimately on the decision of the hierarchy, and is more in the realm of social action than in that of theory or research, the sociologist

[13] H. A. Reinhold, Pastor, *Books on Trial,* X, 2 (1951), 105 f. Betty Bartelme, Staff Member, *The Catholic Worker,* XVIII, 3 (1952), 5.

must find it a fascinating question. For both clergy and laity it may well be the most important question that has come out of the controversy on parish sociology.

Is the present territorial and social structure of the urban parish the best possible arrangement through which the day-by-day work can be carried on for the sanctification and salvation of American urban people?[14] To what extent is it succeeding in this exalted objective; to what extent is it failing? What structural changes can be introduced? What substitutes offered?

The parish structure is a system evolving out of the experience of the Church, decreed by the Council of Trent and ordered by the Canon Law of 1918. This is solemn and official approval of the parochial system which cannot be lightly disregarded by clergy or laity. At the same time, it must be realized that the Church over the centuries has shown itself an excellent anthropologist in understanding the institutions of a people, and a competent social engineer in adapting new forms when they are needed. It is conceivable that our urbanized, industrialized society, which is unique in the history of the world, requires a unique re-structuring of religious forms and institutions.

This is the question for which the serious student of society must try to provide an answer if his research is to be of service to the Church. There is at present a growing storehouse of sociological knowledge upon which the Church can draw in order to introduce some changes. The decision for some reformation within the present parochial structure need not wait until "all the facts are in."[15] Society keeps moving, and continuous change is one of the central facts of our American social life.

The study of change and of social experimentation is in itself an area for social research. While it would be temerarious to maintain that the territorial parish has outlived its usefulness in American cities, it is necessary to realize that the vitality and flexibility of the Church (as a social system) allows and invites constant efforts at improvement. These experiments must not be shrugged

[14] See my article "The Southern Parish Controversy" in *The Priest*, VIII, 1 (1952), 21 f.

[15] Nor need we impede research and delay social reform while we quibble, for example, whether a certain category of parishioners represents 45.4 per cent or 44.5 per cent.

off as the fringe activities of the discontented minority within the Church. In some instances they may be that, but underlying all of them is the psychological and sociological need for meeting the challenge to the spiritual life from a changing culture.

The "reshaping" of social relations and social structures within the Church now appears to be a trend toward extra-parochial activities, or "interest communalities" on the part of the laity. They are satisfying their spiritual and social needs in groupings of their own choice rather than in the parish group to which they "belong" by virtue of residence. There seems to be a trend also to large, loosely structured mass movements like the informal Christopher clubs. On the more technical side there has been a multiplication of modest urban chapels around which small groups cluster and in which the relation between priest and people is closer and informal. In short, all of these examples seem to show that in our urban society ascribed status in pre-determined grouping has become culturally and psychologically less effective than achieved status in voluntary structures.

Until professional social scientists are employed for the purpose, the actual social engineering which manouevers these changes will be done by the clergy and people who constitute the groups to be changed. Meanwhile the social scientist must be aware of this major issue of "social restructuring" as he goes about his studies and research. Momentous changes have occurred in every other institution, some pointing toward a better society, some toward the disintegration of social relations. These examples of extra-religious institutional and structural changes have been quite thoroughly studied by sociologists. The comparative knowledge gained from them could be helpful in understanding the possibilities for "reshaping the urban parishes."

In summary, it may be said that these half-dozen major issues in the sociology of the parish tend to overlap. Two of them view the reciprocal influence of Church and society: (1) the manner in which urban society affects religion, and (2) the way in which the Church influences the rest of society. Two of them revolve around the problem of social integration: (3) whether individual choice can be accepted as a principle of social unity, and (4) the fact that the sacraments and the liturgy intrinsically imply social integration. The next issue (5) treats the possibility of studying

religious motivation, and finally (6) the question of reshaping the parochial structure is discussed.

Although these questions overlap, they are neither complete nor exclusive. Other problematic issues of parochial sociology will appear as the constant work of research and study goes forward. It seems important to approach them with the greatest humility, and with the conviction that they are relevant and significant for the progress of the Church on earth.

JOSEPH H. FICHTER, S.J.

Loyola University of the South
New Orleans, La.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for May, 1903, by Fr. H. T. Henry, of Overbrook, presents two medieval Latin hymns on the Ascension, with Fr. Henry's own translation in the same meter. . . . Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P., of England, writes on "The Code of Hammurabi," which was discovered in 1902. He points out the similarity of the laws laid down by the Babylonian king to the prescriptions contained in the Pentateuch, but concludes that a dependence of the biblical legislation on the code of Hammurabi would not derogate from the inspired character of the former, since inspiration can mean "a divine illumination falling upon already existing data, which the author is divinely moved to commit to writing." . . . The article "In Father Martin's Library" is a fantasy about a priest who appeared at the gate of heaven after a life of ease with the least possible effort toward the salvation of the souls of his parishioners. . . . Fr. A. McDonald continues his series on the apostolic origin of the Apostles' Creed, drawing his arguments from the writings of the early Fathers. . . . Fr. H. Wyman, C.S.P., discusses the power of scholastic philosophy to furnish the human mind with certainty. . . . An anonymous writer, signing himself S.L.T., contributes a lengthy article on the rubrics of Votive Masses. . . . In the Conference section, Fr. Gavisk, of Indianapolis, expresses doubts as to the validity of Baptism conferred by Baptists, on the ground that they lack the requisite intention. . . . A correspondent signing himself J. F. S., writing from London, defends Abbé Loisy against some statements made in a previous issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. . . . The editor informs the readers that much praise has been given to the article on the findings of the Philippine Commission, contributed by Fr. Middleton, O.S.A., to the March issue.

F. J. C.

OF COURSE YOU CAN SING!

Sadly enough, as every priest knows, the Holy Ghost bestows no particular singing ability with the Holy Oils of Ordination. The art of singing, for it is an art, is acquired by practice—long but fruitful practice.

Today, as in the past, song brings life to the liturgy of the Mass. The ordinary Christian cannot hear the sonorous cadences of the Latin pronunciations in the Epistle and Gospel. During most of the Mass, the priest's back is to the laity. The only voice in the High Mass encouraging the "Sunday Missal" strugglers, the only voice calling the lethargic to turn their gaze from the hat of the lady in the second pew, is the voice of the priest. Would that the song of that voice were something to be cherished!

Gregorian chant, most music professors agree, is the perfect music. It is the simplest and most beautiful because it emphasizes the words and not the mechanics of musical notation. For musical inspiration, where can we find greater words than those used in the sacred liturgy? They are divinely inspired words set to music.

The *Pater noster*, the perfect prayer, fell from Christ's own lips. Yet the average priest, from a lack of talent, or more possibly from a lack of effort, merely drones the chant to this prayer at his daily Mass. The chant accompaniment for the *Pater noster* is unequaled—"simplex munditiis," as Horace put it. It is so unobtrusive, yet it embodies a wealth of meaning almost beyond words. With a little effort, many a priest could make this prayer more meaningful for his parishoners.

Priests must make their learning a living reality for the laity. They must be concrete and practical when dealing with everyday people of the world. Music is one means of being concrete; it puts vitality into the worship of God. When we were children, our parents did not teach us to do good and avoid evil by blandly saying, "Do good and avoid evil." Instead, we sat on our mother's knee while she sang a nursery rhyme or told us a fable from Aesop. Similarly, Christ talked to the people of Galilee about fishermen and farmers, barns and vineyards. In Jerusalem, Christ instructed the educated Scribes and Pharisees in terms of

the Law and the Prophets. Christ instilled lofty, abstract ideals into the people by concrete, understandable language.

Music, the universal language, is familiar to everybody and even though many people have never heard of Gregorian chant, they recognize a satisfying piece of music. That is the reason the Church permeates her divine worship with music; the reason she asks her children to raise their voices in song; the reason David, inspired by the Holy Ghost, composed his psalms for the harp.

Song is the product of the human mind and voice. Most of the time, our minds work all right, our voices not so well. Franz Schubert calls the human voice the most perfect musical instrument in creation and, like all musical instruments, the voice responds to correct use.

Fundamentals come first in any learning process. Some compare the voice to wind instruments like the saxophone or clarinet, since the operating principle for both is the same. In the voice, air, forced over the vocal chords in the throat, produces sounds that resound in the sinus cavities of the head. One can feel this resonance experimentally by humming since the tingling sensations felt in the cavities below the cheek-bones indicate the proper placing of the tone. If your tongue or the roof of your mouth tickles, you are humming incorrectly.

Breathing, the most fundamental factor for the singer, gives the tone a substantial support if it originates from the natural use of the diaphragmatic muscle. Small babies, if you have ever noticed, breath exclusively from the diaphragm. Their stomachs, rather than their chests, rise and fall in the regular rhythm of solid, sure breathing.

The diaphragm is the muscle located approximately at the bottom rib, separating the stomach from the lungs. In correct breathing, the stomach is forced out by the diaphragm's causing the lungs to fill with air. Naturally, the chest will expand some, but not a great deal. Breathing from the diaphragm gives a steady, muscular control to breath emission, but if lacking, it produces an unpleasing vibrato or tremulo in the voice and short, snatchy phrasing in song. Anyone that has done any singing, or listened with his ear cocked critically, has noticed this effect for himself.

Caruso claimed the opera singer must have a barrel-shaped

chest which means the singer should be capable of a large breath capacity. A few minutes each day can increase a shallow breath capacity. Set aside three or four minutes of your day to take deep breaths, as deep as you are physically able, and then exhale slowly and regularly. At first you might get dizzy but don't be alarmed. This is a natural effect for it is the way your lungs register surprise at being blown up to capacity. After the first exercise or so you will be shipping air like a balloon.

In exhalation, the diaphragm forces air from the lungs and then the mouth. Ordinarily, it is a straight up-and-down action, while in singing, it should be a little different. Try to emit the breath in a parabolic arc; in other words, think of the breath hitting the roof of the mouth on the hard palate above the teeth. After the breath has passed over the vocal chords in the throat, it has acquired vibrations that need amplification. These vibrations resound in the sinus cavities of the bony structure of the head upon striking the hard palate producing a resonant, amplified singing tone. The sinus cavities of the head function like the sounding board of the piano. They give the tone color and body. This constant airing out, as it were, of the sinus cavities is one reason why a good singer seldom has sinus trouble.

Placing the tone behind the upper teeth is difficult. It involves a lot of practice and concentration before it comes with ease. Nevertheless, this is the natural position for right tone production in speaking as well as singing. The "pear-shaped" tone speech professors constantly stress is produced just like a good singing tone.

One big help in placing a tone forward, as musicians say, is long vowel pronunciation. For a while, we should exaggerate the vowels by opening the mouth wide and giving each vowel its due quantity. Caruso said that no good singer ever had a small mouth and Victor Herbert instructed his chorus members to put old thread spools lengthwise between their teeth while practicing the musical scale on vowels.

John McCormack was famous for his bell-like vowels. While still a young lad, McCormack was returning to his room one day when the housemaid stopped him. "Mister McCormack," she said, "why didn't you sing an English song at the play last night?" John was speechless. He had sung an English song. Presently, he answered the maid, but he never forgot the incident.

The obscurity of his words, he later pointed out, originated from sloppy vowel pronunciation. The words of a song, for McCormack, were the soul of the song, and, in music, the vowels are what make the words. Even though the priest sings in Latin, he can make the words intelligible, and consequently the singing better.

These pointers on good tone production are fortified in practice by three irretractable rules: (1) relax; (2) relax still more; and (3) be perfectly relaxed! Nothing ruins an attempt quicker than lack of relaxation. It makes the tone brittle and vacuous; the singer, ghastly. What an ungodly feeling to hear somebody singing through his teeth, as tense as a snare drum! Bing Crosby pleases his listeners, because he relaxes when he sings, passing that delightful relaxation to his audience. Bing's voice is not the finest, but it is certainly the most popular in our time. The mystery behind it? He literally makes us relax and the more we relax, the more we listen.

Relaxing, among other things, pooh-poohs an odd misconception of would-be singers who think facial contortions improve the song. It only increases the anguish of the singer and of the listener. Facial contortions result from two things: (1) the singer is extremely nervous; and (2) the tones, instead of being forward, come from the back of the throat. The less frowning, the less tilting the head like a chicken, and the less giraffe-like stretching of the neck, the better the musical result.

In reality though, a bit of nervousness is a considerable asset because it adds a pleasing timbre to the voice. Furthermore it makes a singer more conscious of the work at hand, and so invites a more thorough concentration.

Success thrives on practice. Even though we tell ourselves (maybe others have told us, too!) that we cannot sing, practice can help us attain perfection that is truly surprising. Most people insist they cannot sing because they have never really tried, or because their pride won't let them attempt something at which they might look foolish. Why is it that people are afraid to sing in public by themselves, yet in choral or group singing you can't hear anybody but them? It proves on the one hand, that very, very few are actually tone-deaf (it is a convenient shell in which to hide), and on the other hand, the vast majority of us have pleasing voices.

Yes, practice is the key to the golden world of song. From practice we build up confidence and a better singing voice; from practice, a bit every day, we can render the chant of the Mass in its prayerful magnificence.

Some years ago, Tommaso Gallozzi, a critic for the London-Italian stage, wrote of two young ladies making their operatic debut. The one young lady, with but few natural gifts and a slight physique, sang the most difficult music with soul-satisfying accuracy and precision. The other at once inspired her hearers with feelings of regret that so charming a natural voice lacked the flexibility acquired only by singing simple scales before opera was attempted.

We can practice the musical scale, DO-RE-MI-FA-SO-LA-TI-DO, in its variations just like the successful young lady did and become rather fine singers of the Lord's Mass. The time to start practicing is right now, not the dim, distant future. Our efforts at being finer singers are not only for our personal emulation, but more, for the glory of the Church.

Schubert's tribute to song and the human voice emphasizes the beauty with which we can adorn the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass by our individual efforts. Schubert said; "Song is indisputably the first article in whole art of music, the axis around which revolves all that is called melody, modulation, and harmony. All instruments are mere imitations of the singing voice. Song sits as a king upon his throne, while round about, all the instruments bow as vassals. The human voice is in the nature of things, the primitive tone, all other voices in the world being but a distant echo of this divine first voice. The human throat is the first, purest, and most admirable instrument of creation."

JOHN P. ASHTON

Mount St. Mary's Seminary
Norwood, Ohio

Answers to Questions

SOCIAL GATHERINGS OF PRIESTS

Question: Would you regard it as praiseworthy to promote social gatherings of priests, or would you consider such gatherings as a manifestation of a worldly spirit?

Answer: When social gatherings of priests are conducted with the decorum that befits ecclesiastics, they constitute a most effective means of fostering the spirit of brotherly affection among the members of the clergy, of giving the younger priests a favorable opportunity to meet their older confreres, of exchanging ideas on theological and pastoral problems, and, above all, of giving encouragement and comfort to those who have encountered difficulties and trials, or who are lonely in their little parishes, or who are becoming discouraged in the daily round of the sacred ministry. The normal human being needs some form of recreation and sociability; and surely it is more suitable for the priest to seek such relief in the company of his brother priests than with the laity. On such occasions as the Forty Hours' Devotion, a parish jubilee, etc., those in charge should try to have as many as possible of the local clergy, both diocesan and religious, on hand to take part in the religious function and then to enjoy the friendliness and innocent gaiety of the social gathering with one another.

A LEGISLATOR'S PROBLEM

Question: Would a Catholic congressman be permitted in conscience to vote for a bill advocating the socialization of some natural resource or industry in the United States?

Answer: While a Catholic could not conscientiously support Socialism as a system, he could undoubtedly favor the socialization of certain forms of industry or of certain particular natural resources. Indeed, according to Pope Pius XI, in *Quadragesimo anno,* "certain kinds of property, it is rightly contended, ought to be reserved to the State, since they carry with them a dominating

power so great that it cannot, without danger to the general welfare, be entrusted to private individuals. Such just demands and desires have nothing in them now which is inconsistent with Christian truth, and much less are they special to Socialism" (cf. *Principles for Peace* [Washington, D. C.: N.C.W.C., 1943], n. 1018). Accordingly, a Catholic legislator need feel no qualms of conscience in voting for the socialization of a resource or industry which he believes possesses great dominating power and hence can be better controlled by the authority of the State than by private individuals.

NON-CATHOLIC AS PROXY AT BAPTISM

Question: May a non-Catholic serve as proxy for a Catholic sponsor at baptism?

Answer: According to Woywood-Smith, "though it is not becoming to appoint as proxies non-Catholics, excommunicated persons or others whom the Code excludes from sponsorship, still the Code does not forbid it" *(A Practical Commentary on the Code of Canon Law* [New York: Wagner, 1952], p. 392). In other words, as far as the *valid* fulfilment of the function of proxy is concerned, it is only necessary that the person designated be capable of accepting the mandate and of performing the material acts connected with the baptism in place of the sponsor. Only the name of the sponsor, not the proxy, need be entered into the baptismal register.

But, as far as the *lawfulness* of the use of a non-Catholic proxy is concerned, the following admonition of Abbo-Hannan should be borne in mind: "In the absence of a very grave cause, the admission of a non-Catholic to share in the ceremonies of baptism is gravely illicit because the proxy assists actively in the ceremonies and because his presence is bound to give scandal" *(The Sacred Canons* [St. Louis: Herder, 1952], p. 765).

COURTSHIP BY A MARRIED PERSON

Question: Since a courtship is forbidden to a person already bound by the ties of marriage, how could one who is planning

(with ecclesiastical permission) to make use of the Pauline Privilege lawfully court the individual whom he intends to marry?

Answer: Though generally speaking it is sinful for a married person to carry on a courtship with a view to another marriage, an exception is to be made for a convert who is preparing to make legitimate use of the Pauline Privilege by contracting a marriage which will automatically dissolve the marriage tie that still binds him. In practice, however, this will never be lawful unless the convert is already separated from his legitimate spouse and it is evident that there is no hope of the resumption of conjugal life *sine contumelia Creatoris.* It should be noted that if the convert and the intended spouse indulge in intercourse during the courtship, they would be guilty of adultery, which would call for a dispensation from the impediment of *crimen* before they could enter a valid marriage (Can. 1075, §1).

MUTILATION FOR THE SAKE OF ANOTHER

Question: Is it permissible for a person with two normal eyes to give the cornea of one to a blind person, thus enabling him to regain partial vision?

Answer: Although not all theologians admit the lawfulness of submitting to a bodily mutilation in order to supply some deficiency in the body of a fellow man, the affirmative opinion seems sufficiently probable to be followed in practice. The basic argument is the natural and supernatural unity of the human race, which justifies a person, generally speaking, in doing for another what he is allowed to do for himself. There are, indeed, certain limitations to this principle. Thus, one may not submit to an operation for the sake of another which would put his own life in grave danger, or sterilize him. But the giving of an eye for the purpose of restoring sight to another would be lawful, according to this solidly probable opinion (cf. Cunningham, *The Morality of Organic Transplantation* [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944]).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FIRST FRIDAY AND GOOD FRIDAY

Question: This year the first Friday of April fell on Good Friday. Did this entail the breaking of the series of the nine First Friday Communions and will the series have to be started over again?

Answer: The text of what is known as the "Great Promise" to St. Margaret Mary requires the Communions to be on nine consecutive Fridays. Commentaries on this subject all agree that if the nine Fridays are interrupted, even through no fault of the person making them, the novena of Holy Communions must be started over again to comply with the conditions attached to the promise. Canon Mahoney interestingly enough makes out a possible case for the opposite opinion, arguing analogously from such practices as the Gregorian Mass series, which is not interrupted by the omission of Mass on Good Friday. However, he does warn that this opinion should not be preached to the laity.

NUPTIAL BLESSING

Question: May the nuptial blessing be given during the two liturgical seasons *(tempus clausum)?* If it is not given at that time may it be given at some later date?

Answer: The Ordinary of the diocese may for a just cause grant permission to impart the nuptial blessing during the Advent and Lenten season. However, if this permission has not been given, the blessing not given on the occasion of the marriage ceremony may be imparted at a later date. When the nuptial blessing is imparted, it may be on a day even when the votive Mass for the newly wed is not permitted. In such a case, when that particular votive Mass is forbidden according to the Ordo, a commemoration of the nuptial Mass is made in the Mass of the day.

The Ritual includes a nuptial blessing to be given immediately after the marriage ceremony when the blessing is allowed but Holy Mass is not celebrated. Likewise, it lists prayers to be recited, at the end of a marriage ceremony, outside of Holy Mass, over a married couple, when the nuptial blessing is not permitted. In both instances, an Apostolic Indult is required; namely to impart the nuptial blessing or to recite the special prescribed prayers.

SCAPULAR MEDAL

Question: I am somewhat confused about a recent question in this review about the scapular. Please answer for me if the scapular medal may be worn in place of the cloth scapular.

Answer: Instead of the cloth scapular, with the exception of Third Order scapulars, a scapular medal may be worn, provided it bears the image of the Sacred Heart of Jesus on the one side and the image of the Blessed Mother on the reverse side. The wearer of such a medal gains all the indulgences and privileges granted for the wearing of the cloth scapular.

VOTIVE MASS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Question: At the beginning of a new semester, is there sufficient reason for permitting a solemn votive Mass to the Holy Spirit in our college chapel? All of the students must attend this Mass and it is questioned if this is sufficient reason for saying this particular Mass. Must this permission be applied for each time we wish it or may the permission granted once be interpreted as a general permission?

Answer: By definition a solemn votive Mass is one celebrated with extrinsic solemnity for a grave and at the same time public reason and with the permission of the Ordinary of the place. Father O'Connell in discussing this particular problem states that it is public when it concerns a community and specifically mentions a college community (S.R.C. 3009 and 3804). Quoting these same decisions of the Congregation of Sacred Rites he states that a solemn votive Mass to the Holy Spirit is permitted for the "opening of the scholastic year in a college." However, he does not mention this permission for each semester but only at the beginning of the scholastic year. Our inquirer must note that the permission of the Ordinary of the place is required. Likewise, the general regulations for any solemn votive Mass must be observed so as not to displace other major feasts. Permission for this solemn votive Mass can be given once and for all or the Ordinary may require a new request to be made each time such a privilege is desired.

FOLDED CHASUBLES

Question: We are wondering if in our seminary chapel we are required to wear the *planeta plicata* (folded chasubles) during Advent and Lent. The rubric in the Missal seems to make a distinction between major and minor churches and has caused concern whether or not the seminary chapel falls under this category.

Answer: The distinction that is made here is brought about by the fact that most churches do not have the folded chasubles. What the rubric insists upon is that in their absence, the deacon and subdeacon do not wear the tunic and dalmatic but rather no outer vestment over the alb. De Herdt states specifically that each and every sacred vestment is required *sub gravi* to be worn in the celebration of Holy Mass. This same author brings out the fact the distinction is about the vestments rather than about major and minor churches.

BLESSING BEFORE CHILDBIRTH

Question: May we be permitted to use the blessing found in the ritual, "Mulieris praegnantis in periculis partus" whenever an expectant mother asks for this special blessing? I hesitate to use this blessing because of the word, "periculis." Please enlighten me in this matter.

Answer: Father Weller in his new edition of the Roman Ritual in the English translation interprets "in periculis partus" as "at the approach of confinement." Canon Mahoney some years ago answered this problem with these words: "Neither the terms of the rite in the Ritual nor the interpretation of the writers, require a special danger." Some hold that since childbirth is always accompanied by some danger, the blessing may be given in all cases. Pregnancy is clearly something distinct from childbirth and as the Ritual reads now, this blessing is not to be given indiscriminately during the period of pregnancy. Father Mahoney informs us that it is easy to get an indult to give this particular blessing of which we speak to expectant mothers at any time during their period of pregnancy.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

Book Reviews

LIFE EVERLASTING. By Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P. Translated by Patrick Cummins, O.S.B. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Company, 1952. Pp. x + 274. $4.50.

In *Life Everlasting*, Father Garrigou-Lagrange seems to be continuing a phase of writing that may be called affective-theological. (Cf. *Our Savior and His Love for Us*, Herder, 1951). In the long run, it is probably a more effective theological approach to accomplish the purpose of this book, ". . . to enlighten souls, to arouse conscience and responsibility" (p. vi), than the strictly technical investigations with which one usually associates the learned Dominican. *Life Everlasting* (the English of *L'éternelle vie et la profondeur de l'âme*) was obviously not written for the teacher of theology nor was it designed as a text for students of *De novissimis*. However, it could prove to be valuable supplementary reading for both these groups. Probably the most ready acceptance will be given the book by the parish priest who will find in it a source for meditations and sermons whose fecundity is not quickly exhausted.

Life Everlasting contains a clear dogmatic exposition of a topic that is most personal to all men, the last things. It is quite difficult to give a theologically accurate yet emotionally satisfactory treatment of death, judgment, heaven, hell and purgatory. The extreme presentations of these topics resolve themselves into either an apologetic presentation that is so unreal that it does not require acceptance, or histrionic bombast that is too hyperbolic to be acceptable. Father Garrigou-Lagrange seems to hit the mean between these extremes. The book captures the mind of the reader because of the loftiness of the topics; it maintains his interest because of the pertinence of the topics to his own life.

In general, *Life Everlasting* is at once highly practical and solidly dogmatic. Sprinkled through its pages are excerpts from the author's own experience that give it a personal touch and save it from being text-bookish. While it was designed as an exposition of one phase of dogmatic theology, it reaches, in many places, heights of devotion and spiritual stimulation that should guarantee its inclusion on the lists of spiritual reading for most priests. It manages to correlate the principles and conclusions of technical theology with the yearnings of the human heart. It is the product of a great mind written through a great heart warmed by devotion. It is, in part, technical but not

stilted; it is scientific, but not cold. It is a book of solid dogma that has flowered into solid piety.

In particular, the author has as his intention to influence his reader's life, not merely to perfect his intellectual virtues. His proposal is "to show what light falls on our life here below from the life there beyond" (p. v). To fulfill this proposal, Father Garrigou-Lagrange has divided his book into five sections: The Immensity of the Soul; Death and Judgment; Hell; Purgatory; Heaven. These sections are each divided into six or seven sub-headings which deal with matters relative to the principal topic of the section. One finds such interesting topics as "The Roots of Vice and Virtue," "Purgatory Before Death," "Hell and Our Own Age," "Purgatory's Chief Pain," "The Nature of Eternal Beatitude," "The Number of the Elect," etc.

Father Garrigou-Lagrange seems to have become so attached to the theological approach to problems, or it to him, that even in a book of this nature he runs the course from the Magisterium to *rationes convenientiae* through Scripture and Patristic Tradition. But far from detracting from the readability of the book, it adds to it, putting the reader into a "set" of familiarity, and putting the matter into order. The usual sources of theology are augmented on the practical level by examples from the lives of the saints, from the liturgy, and from personal experience, which add no little to the conviction of the pertinence of the topic of the book.

One difficulty in the book for the ordinary reader is that to follow up many of the subjects introduced requires a knowledge of French and Latin, and presupposes availability of very technical books and dictionaries of theology. A valuable editorial task would be to indicate English titles that are available for further study on individual topics in the book. Stylistically, the book is surprisingly good, even though there is considerable repetition. The translation is good, free from the Gallicanisms one could expect to hang over from the original French. Occasionally (but rarely) one happens upon a peculiar use of the word "already" that seems indigenous to some parts of the American midwest. Generally, however, the Englishing is very creditable indeed. *Life Everlasting* has a good index of more than 200 entries, the value of which, to parish priests especially, is obvious. From almost every aspect, this book can be recommended without qualification.

JOHN P. WHALEN

No Secret Is Safe. By Mark Tennien, M.M. Introduction by Cardinal Spellman. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1952. Pp. 270. $3.50.

By the fall of 1949 only two of China's southwestern provinces, Kwangsi and Kwangtung, remained in the hands of the retreating Nationalists. And before that fateful winter had passed, these, too, had been swallowed up by the Communist First Army under General Lin Piao, whose name more recently has been linked with the aggression in Korea.

The author of this book is already familiar to a wide audience as the hero of the Maryknoll film, *Blue Cloud Country*, and as the author of *Chungking Listening Post*. He is a veteran of twenty years in China. He was there when the Communists first marched into his mission station in Shumkai, in the province of Kwangsi, and was there for another two years while the political commissars put the finishing touches to the conquest of their armies. He might still be there, but probably in jail or under the good earth by this time, if his Yankee "unco-operativeness" had not irked them into expelling him.

Fortunately for us, Father Tennien is not still behind the Bamboo Curtain; for if he had not returned to the free world we would not have his valuable, first-hand observations on how Chinese Communism really works. Even if he had not returned, we would have, however, his day-by-day diary which he smuggled out before he himself was released and upon which *No Secret Is Safe* is based.

Fathier Tennien avoids the spectacular; he records the impact of Communism on himself, his people and the neighborhood in a calm, straightforward manner that lends all the more credence and cumulative effect to his story. There is added credence in that he does not describe all the Communists as inhuman monsters, but rather as individual human beings, who sometimes make mistakes, who sometimes permit themselves to be bribed, who sometimes apologize, who sometimes get beaten at their own games, who sometimes are kind, and who are not above the common Oriental custom of "saving face."

No Secret Is Safe, by telling what happened in only one small area, really tells the tragic story of the Communist regimentation of the entire Chinese people and the gradual strangulation of their individual liberties. It recounts, with actual incidents, the thorough methods of Communist indoctrination. It vividly describes how a whole people were deceived by the "agrarian reformers" and how they were forced into spying on one another and often stimulated into mob violence against their neighbors. It relates Communist procedures in wringing confessions of guilt and in dispensing justice by kangaroo

courts. And, of course, what Communists think and do about religion has not been overlooked.

The reviewer does not agree entirely with Father Tennien's seeming pessimism about the future of Christianity in China; nor should one draw the conclusion that the cruelties he describes are always to be equated with Communism. True, the Communists have used the weapon of terror on a greater scale than ever dreamed of before, but many of the methods of cruelty are part and parcel of Chinese history and were practiced before the Communists came. Unfortunately, too, the book is marred by a number of typographical errors, and one could wish that the price were a bit lower so that *No Secret Is Safe* might enjoy the wider popularity it should have.

WILLIAM D. RYAN

THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD. By Rt. Rev. Benedict Bauer, O.S.B. Translated from the German by Rev. Edward Malone, O.S.B. Vols. I and II. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1952. Pp. x + 590 and iv + 463. $7.50 per volume.

Thanks to papal stimulus and encouragement over the last half century, more and more people today are beginning to draw the true Christian spirit from its "primary and indispensable source," the liturgy. It still comes as a surprise to some, however, to discover that the liturgical revival is as much interested in promoting a strong and healthy interior life as it is in popularizing participation in the external worship of the Church. The explanation and clarification of this duality of purpose is perhaps the greatest contribution which *Mediator Dei* has made to the present liturgical revival.

And yet, it sometimes happens that those who are trying to shape their interior life according to the pattern set out by the liturgy find themselves in a dilemma over such an elemental thing as the morning meditation. The question in their minds is not whether to meditate or not to meditate or even what to meditate on, since the Church has provided for them both the motive and subject matter of mental prayer. Rather, the problem lies in the dichotomy which sometimes springs up between conviction and ability. One may realize, for example, that the Missal and Breviary provide abundant subject matter for mental prayer, and yet he may find himself at a loss when it comes to transferring this matter from the book into his heart and life. The Mass texts are found either to contain such a rich fund of material that it is difficult to select one point, or such a distillation of doctrine that it can be penetrated only after a long and laborious process.

It is precisely in the hands of such persons that Abbot Benedict Bauer's *The Light of the World* will find a hearty welcome. "The present work is intended to increase the reader's acquaintance with the feasts of the Church and with her teaching as found in the missal so that these may become a fruitful background for mental prayer and a help and protection for Christian life."

These two volumes contain meditations on the texts of the Sunday Masses arranged in such a way that one meditation is provided for each day of the week for the entire year. By this constant recalling and ever deeper penetration of the spirit of the Sunday Mass, the reader begins to see Sunday as a pattern of life reaching out through the week and touching each day with its grace-filled message. The danger of sameness or monotony is skillfully averted by the author. While admitting that the liturgy "delights in repetition," Abbot Benedict shows in each meditation how "we can and should always exercise a new faith, confidence and love, and offer ourselves anew to God" every day.

Although he has rightly given the Sunday Masses the most attention, the author has seasoned his work with a sprinkling of well-chosen feasts of the sanctoral cycle. In the first volume, which covers from Advent to Pentecost Saturday, one finds meditations on the saints of Christmas week and Epiphanytide together with a meditation for each of the great Antiphons. The second volume, from Trinity Sunday to the last Sunday after Pentecost, concludes with thirty-three pages of meditations on special feasts of the Pentecost cycle and the important Common of the dedication of a church.

The quality of these meditations is such that their conscientious use will profit the experienced spiritual director quite as much as his newest penitent who is taking his first steps in the direction of a serious Christian life. But if one is looking for a meditation book which does all the work for him, he will be disappointed in *The Light of the World*. There are no ready-made resolutions of prefabricated affections to be found in this work. Rather, "following the liturgical sequence freely and without constraint, we have carefully refrained from attempting to force the thoughts and teachings found in the texts of the Mass into a prearranged scheme or into a system of the spiritual life. We have simply allowed ourselves to be guided and instructed by the liturgy, that is by the praying and offering Church." Because its message has been fashioned by both the praying and offering Church, *The Light of the World* is able to offer the reader a happy blend of the spirit of the Mass texts and the action of the Mass itself. In this way it makes an important contribution toward